The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v. 39

THE

Church of England Pulpit.

AND

Ecclesiastical Review.

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1895.

VOL. XXXIX.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXIX.

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Bishop of Lincoln—The Oxford Calcutta Mission ... 73
Bishop of Manchester—Roman Claims 85
Bishop of Peterborough—Law as Leader to Christ... 49
Bishop of Ripon—The Voices of the Universe ... 37
Adderley, Rev. James, M.A.—The Church and Present Day Progress... 135
Ainger, Rev. Alfred, M.A.—Immanuel 76
Biddell, Rev, H., M.A.—God's Treasure in Earthen Vessels 245
Bradley, Very Rev. G. Granville, D.D.—Robert Bruce's Perseverance 64
Chadwick, Very Rev. George A., D.D. — The Dream of Reunion 181
Dwyer, Rev. Canon Philip, M.A.—Hatred, Envy, and Avarice at Work 157
Evans, Rev. H. Heber, B.A.—The Duty of Thanksgiving 220
Farrar, Very Rev. Dean F. W., D.D., F.R.S.—Three Inspired Poets 121
Farrar, Very Rev. Dean F. W., D.D., F.R.S.—Observance of Lent 196
Farrar, Very Rev. Dean F. W., D.D., F.R.S—The Silence of God 205
Fry, Dr. T. C.—The Christianity of Investments ... 113
Fry, Dr. T. C.—Mountains to Lay Low 145
Ganly, Rev. Charles W., M.A.—Always Rejoicing 4
Ganly, Rev. Charles W., M.A.—The Temples of the Holy Ghost 159
Gent, Rev. George W., M.A.—Conversion... ... 209
Gore, Rev. Canon Charles, M.A.—"Buying Up the Opportunity" 13
Gore, Rev. Canon Charles, M.A.—Commandment *v.* Tradition 217
Gore, Rev. Canon Charles, M.A.—Suffering and Reigning 229
Gore, Rev. Canon Charles, M.A.—The Vocation of a Bishop 253
Gore, Rev. Canon Charles, M.A.—The Atonement 265
Gore, Rev. Canon Charles, M.A.—The Athanasian Creed 301
Ingram, Rev. A. F. W.—The Classes and the Masses 133
Jenkins, Rev. W. H., T.C.D.—Salt With Savour and Without It 185
Lang, Rev. C. G., M.A.—The Light of Life ... 42
Lock, Rev. W., M.A.—Christ and Sin 294
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A.—Christ Knocking at the Door 1
Murton, Rev. George, M.A.—Strangers and Pilgrims on Earth 306
Newbolt, Rev. W. C. E., M.A.—The Easter Revelation 280

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Paget, Rev. Francis, D.D.—Christ's Presence and Christian Fasting 124
Parsons, Rev. W. H.—God's Variety 101
Randolph, Rev. B. W., M.A.—Spiritual Strength .. 29
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon W. E., M.A.—The Victory of Goodness 61
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon W. E., M.A.—The Hebrew Prophet's Lesson to England 88
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon W. E., M.A.—Balaam: a Lesson to the Man of the World and to the Professional Ecclesiastic 241
Reid, Rev. J.—The Wells of Salvation 169
Ridgeway, Rev. C. J., M.A.—Godliness 97
Roberts, Rev. J. Llewellyn, M.A.—Unwise Conceits 148
Sandlands, Rev. J. P., M.A.—Paul's Prayer for the Romans 18
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon H., M.A.—Natural Law and Spiritual Law 25
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon H., M.A.—St. Paul's Theology 109
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon H., M.A.—Dogma as a Social Force 277
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—The Great Triumph 98
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—God our Joy... ... 172
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—The Great House .. 231
Stubbs, Very Rev. Dean C. W., D.D.—Ministers of Our Lord the King 193
Terry, Rev. G. F., L.Th.—The Light of the Ages 52
Worthington-Atkin, Rev. J., M.A.—Church Workers 257

SERMONS ON :—

Christ Knocking at the Door—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 1
Always Rejoicing—By Rev. Charles W. Ganly, M.A. 4
"Buying Up the Opportunity"—By Rev. Canon Charles Gore, M.A. 13
Paul's Prayer for the Romans—By Rev. J. P. Sandlands, M.A. 18
Natural Law and Spiritual Law—By Rev. Canon H. Scott-Holland, M.A. 25
Spiritual Strength—By Rev. B. W. Randolph, M.A. 29
The Voices of the Universe—By Bishop of Ripon ... 37
The Light of Life—By Rev. C. G. Lang, M.A. ... 42
Law as Leader to Christ—By Bishop of Peterborough 49
The Light of the Ages—By Rev. G. F. Terry, L.Th. 52
The Victory of Goodness—By Rev. Canon W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 61
Robert Bruce's Perseverance—By Very Rev. G. Granville Bradley, D.D. 64

283.05
CHU
V. 39

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

The Oxford Calcutta Mission—By Bishop of Lincoln 73
Immanuel—By Rev. Alfred Ainger, M.A. 76
Roman Claims—By Bishop of Manchester 85
The Hebrew Prophet's Lesson to England—By Rev. Canon W. E. Rawstorne, M.A.... 88
Godliness—By Rev. C. J. Ridgeway, M.A.... .. 97
The Great Triumph—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 98
God's Variety—By Rev. W. H. Parsons 101
St. Paul's Theology—By Rev. Canon H. Scott-Holland, M.A. 109
The Christianity of Investments—By Rev. Dr. T. C. Fry... 113
Three Inspired Poets—By Very Rev. Dean F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 121
Christ's Presence and Christian Fasting—By Rev. Francis Paget, D.D. 124
The Classes and the Masses—By Rev. A. F. W. Ingram 133
The Church and Present Day Progress—By Rev. James Adderley, M.A. 135
Mountains to Lay Low—By Dr. T. C. Fry 145
Unwise Conceits—By Rev. J. Llewellyn Roberts ... 148
Hatred, Envy, and Avarice at Work—By Rev. Canon Philip Dwyer, M.A. 157
The Temples of the Holy Ghost—By Rev. Charles W. Ganly, M.A. 159
The Wells of Salvation—By Rev. J. Reid 169
God our Joy—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. ... 172
The Dream of Reunion—By Very Rev. George A. Chadwick, D.D. 181
Salt With Savour and Without It—By Rev. W. H. Jenkins, T.C.D. 185
Ministers of Our Lord the King—By Very Rev. C. W. Stubbs, D.D. 193
Observance of Lent—By Very Rev. Dean F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 196
The Silence of God—By Very Rev. Dean F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 205
Conversion—By Rev. George W. Gent, M.A ... 209
Commandment *v.* Tradition—By Rev. Canon Charles Gore, M.A. 217
The Duty of Thanksgiving—By Rev. H. Heber Evans, B.A. 220
Suffering and Reigning—By Rev. Canon Charles Gore, M.A. 229
The Great House—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 231
Balaam : a Lesson to the Man of the World and to the Professional Ecclesiastic—By Rev. Canon W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 241
God's Treasures in Earthen Vessels—By Rev. H. Biddell, M.A. 245
The Vocation of a Bishop—By Rev. Canon Charles Gore, M.A. 253
Church Workers—By Rev. J. Worthington-Atkin, M.A. 257
The Atonement—By Rev. Canon Charles Gore, M.A. 265
Dogma as a Social Force—By Rev. Canon H. Scott-Holland, M.A. 277
The Easter Revelation—By Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A. 280
The Voices of the Universe—By Bishop of Ripon... 289
Christ and Sin—By Rev. W. Lock, M.A. 294
The Athanasian Creed—By Rev. Canon Charles Gore, M.A. 301
Strangers and Pilgrims on Earth—By Rev. George Murton, M.A. 306

LEADING ARTICLES :—

1894—1895 7
Angels and Ministers of Grace 21
Lies! 21
The Future of Voluntary Schools 31
Education and Disestablishment 45

LEADING ARTICLES :— PAGE

Moderately Progressive 54
The Decline of Dissent 67
Church Schools... 68
Clever Heathens 79
Much Misunderstood 91
Limpets... 92
Re-union 103
The New London County Council 115
Fasting and Abstinence 127
Prudential Assurance Company 128
Progressive Amenities... 138
Religious Instruction to the Fore 149
Taffy's Odd Trick 162
Easter Offerings 174
Easter Eggs 187
No Use 188
The Pope's Pastoral and Re-union 199
The Bishop of Durham on Peace 200
Pew Rents 212
"Re-Marriage" after Divorce 223
The Welsh Disestablishment Bill 234
Morituri 248
Opium *Sine Dignitate*... 259
Counsels of Despair 271
State Aid 284
Cromwell 297
Like Lucifer 308
The Finale of the Newcastle Programme Supporters 309

CHURCH NOTES, 9, 22, 33, 46, 56, 70, 81, 94, 105, 116, 128, 139, 150, 163, 188, 201, 213, 224, 235, 249, 260, 272, 285, 298, 310

PAPERS :—

A Note on the Temptations of Our Lord — By C. J. W. 34
Woman Suffrage to the Fore 93
The Path of Safety for the Doubtful—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds... 117
The Making of Mind—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 129
What We Know of God by Reason apart from Scripture—By Rev, Prebendary Reynolds 140
Existence as a Note of Interrogation, with the General Answer—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 151
The Continuity of Possession at the Reformation—By Rev. C. F. Brown, B.D. 152
Reason as the Basis of Faith—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 164
The Making of Mind, Part II.—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 175
The Church in Wales and the Welsh People—By Bishop of Bangor 176
The Wise and the Foolish View of Life—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 189
The Ascent of Man—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 202
The Higher Ascent of Man—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 214
Notes of a New Year's Sermon—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A, ... 214
God Living in the World—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 226
Things in General—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds... 236
Thoughts on the Sacrifices, the Passover, and the Sacraments... 236
Some Things in Particular—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds 250
What is Life?—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds ... 262
What is Death?—By Rev. Prebendary Reynolds ... 273
On the Incarnation—By Canon MacColl 286
On Miracles—By Rev. Prebendary Shelford ... 299
The Resurrection—By Rev. J. Macarthur 311

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK 11, 32, 57, 67, 83, 130, 140, 149, 164, 175, 203, 222, 240, 250, 263, 270, 283, 300, 312

988273

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :— PAGE

"*The Humanitarian*" 23
"*The Expositor*" 35, 82, 190, 238, 287
"*The Expository Times*" 35, 82, 156, 190, 239, 287
"The Four Gospels, from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest"—By Agnes Smith Lewis, M.R.A.S. 35
"Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee" ... 47
"Round the World from London Bridge to Charing Cross *viâ* Yokohama and Chicago" 47
"Missionary Methods of the Evangelisation of the Non-Christian World"—By Robert Needham Cust, LL.D. 57
"*The Thinker*" 82
"As Others Saw Him"—Wm. Heinemann ... 141
"Higher Criticism. Old Testament Theology"—By Dr. Hermann Schultz 165
"History, Prophecy, and the Monuments"—By James Fred. McCurdy, Ph.D., LL.D. 165
"Lex Mosaica"—Edited by Rev. Richard Valpy French, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A. 274

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Corrigenda 10
Disestablishment *v.* Tithes 10
Parish Councils... 23
The Sinai Palimpsest 47, 60
Conformity *v.* Nonconformity 47, 60, 71
"Christ's Holy Catholic Church," according to Church Principles... ... ... 82, 106
Disestablishment 83
The One True Church... 95
Wales and the Church 106
The Church and its Members 118
Dr. Davidson on the New Testament 119
The Creeds 119
What is the Church? 130, 155
St. James's Disused Churchyard, Pentonville-road ... 130
Dr. Martineau and the Sermon on the Mount ... 131
The Resurrection of the Body 142
Bird Protection... 143
A Criticism 167, 191
The Composition of the House of Commons ... 167
Dr. Fry's Sermon 178
What We Know of God by Reason apart from Scripture 179
The Higher Criticism 190, 203
Dr. Drummond's Hibbert Lectures 202

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

The New Testament and the Pagan Moralists ... 215
The Pope's Encyclical 226
The Report of the Opium Commission 239
Christianity and Science 251, 275
The Microbe of Death 263
Parliamentary Grants to Dissenters 276
Sleepless Nights 287

MISCELLANEOUS :—

The Rev. A. H. Arden as an Indian Missionary ... 11
The Rev. J. Armitage Robinson installed Prebendary at Wells 11
The East London Church Fund 11
Missions to Seamen 11, 113
Rev. Canon Benham on "The Peace of God" ... 12
Bishop Cramer-Roberts 18
Michael Ernest Sadler, Director of Special Inquiries and Reports 20
Sir Richard E. Webster on the Discretion to Grant Licenses for Marriage of Divorced Persons ... 48
Missionary Activity in China 57
Rev. Dr. Percival's Appointment as Bishop of Hereford 76
Annual Meetings of the S.P.G. 104
Mr. Ewan Christian, Architect 115
Church Attendance during the Frost... 130
Dr. Alice Marston on Chinese Mission Work ... 149
Retreats and Quiet Days 161
Transit of Cattle and Public Slaughter-houses 180, 227
The Church Pastoral Aid 211
The Peace Congress of 1895 227
The Lady Margaret Professorship of Divinity at Oxford 240
Annual Report of the Peace Society, 1895 259
Testimonial to Dean Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.... ... 286
Annual Ecclesiastical and Educational Art Exhibition 296
Two Inaugural and Rede Lectures at Cambridge ... 296

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS, 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

CLERICAL OBITUARY, 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

The Church of England Pulpit
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIX.—NO. 993. SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1895. [PRICE ONE PENNY.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRIST KNOCKING AT THE DOOR.

BY THE REV. B. MATURIN, M.A., VICAR OF LYMINGTON, AND RURAL DEAN OF LYNDHURST.

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF POOLE, DORSET, ON SUNDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 25TH, 1894.

"Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me."—REVELATION iii. 20.

"BEHOLD, I stand at the door and knock!" My brethren, of whom speaketh the prophet this of himself, or of some other man? Who is He who thus, in the attitude of condescending, forbearing, and forgiving love, stands at the door and knocks? It is the Lord Jesus Christ! The Prince of the kings of the earth, and the "beginning of the creation of God!" It is He Who stands and knocks. And at whose door does He knock? Why, at the door of the lukewarm Laodicean Church. And does He approve of Her state that He thus comes to her? Far otherwise, listen to His language, "Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of My mouth." He looked upon her state with abhorrence. I would thou wert cold or hot. But to be lukewarm, admitting the great facts of the wondrous redeeming love of Christ, and then treating them with indifference, is a state of mind and heart that justly merits the strong condemnation of Jesus Christ. Alas! I fear the generation of the Laodiceans is not yet extinct. There are, it has been said, but two consistent characters on earth, the barefaced infidel on the one hand who denies the existence of God, and believes in no heaven or hell, and says, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," or the downright practical Christian, who can say with Paul, "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowlege of Christ Jesus my Lord," and lives as seeing that God Who is invisible. Such was not the state of the Laodicean Church. But still unwilling to cast her off for ever, He "counsels" her—in her proud, but wretched, miserable, poor, blind, and naked condition—"to buy of Him gold tried in the fire that she may be rich, and white raiment to cover the shame of her nakedness, and eye-salve that she may see"; and, pondering over her with pity, He says, "As many as I love I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent;" and then follow the striking, solemn words of our text: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock."

To the consideration of these words I call your attention to-night, and may God give to all the hearing ear and the understanding heart while I set before you—1. The statement of the text, "I stand at the door and knock"; 2. The attention this statement demands, "Behold, I stand and knock."

I.—"I, Jesus, stand at the door and knock—at the *door*," the entrance to the human heart. And why stand there? Why does He not enter? Simply because the door of man's heart is closed against Him! Open, indeed, to the world with all its cares, crosses, and anxieties; its frivolities, pleasures, and baseness. The cry of man still is, "What shall we eat, what shall we drink, and wherewithal shall we be clothed?"—living in sin and pleasure, and forgetting the great God that made and redeemed him. The heart of man is like the inn on the night of the Saviour's birth. He was born in a stable and laid in a manger, and why, because "there was no room for Him in the inn." Plenty of guests filled the chambers of that inn, but no room for the child Jesus. Such is the heart of man. There is a famous picture by Holman Hunt illustrating this subject, which I have seen. There is the door grown over with ivy and weeds, its hinges are rusty, it is fast closed and shut up, while there stands without, in the cold of the night, an illustrious stranger, the lamp shedding its feeble light on the features of His countenance, His hand on the door as He gives utterance to the words, "I stand at the door and knock." And can it be that this is a true picture of the heart of any that hear me this night? The door clogged and closed, barred and bolted

against the Redeemer of mankind! Oh, brethren, 'to-day, if you still hear His voice, harden not your hearts, lest He swear in His wrath that you shall never enter into His rest."

But what means this knocking? How, it may be asked, does He knock? Why, brethren, He knocks in various ways, He knocks to-night in the *preaching of His Gospel.* The Gospel is the proclamation of God's love to man. Its language is, "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And the voice of Jesus, unbroken by distance, still sounds along the centuries of time and falls on the ear of weary humanity, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Oh, brethren, whenever you open your Bibles and read of the gracious words that fell from His lips, hear His parables, witness His miracles of mercy, when you see Him taking up the infants in His arms, and saying, "Of such is the kingdom of God," when you read of "the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched," when you are carried upward in thought to contemplate the happiness of heaven and the home of the blessed, "His Father's house with its many mansions," and hear Him say, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me," it is the voice of Jesus pleading with you, the hand of Jesus knocking at the door of your heart and saying, "Sinner, open to me."

Or, again, He comes in the still small voice of *conscience*, perhaps in the dead of the night, pleading with you, reminding you of sins past, but long forgotten, reasoning with you of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," so that, like Felix, you tremble at the felt presence of an invisible God. Oh, is it not the hand of Jesus knocking at your heart, and saying, "Sinner, open to me"? and thus, by the pleadings of His Spirit, speaking within you and applying the truths of His Gospel to your souls, and causing His word, like a two-edged sword, to penetrate to "the dividing asunder of soul and spirit," Jesus stands and knocks at the door of your hearts. But if you still refuse to hearken to the gentle accents of His love, He may come to you in the loud call of His *providence* or the terrors of affliction, with the sledge-hammer of His power thundering at your door, sickness enters your family, death stalks in, and as one or another of your dear ones is taken from you and laid in the narrow house appointed for all living, and standing by the open grave, you hear the solemn words, "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," is there not a voice from the eternal world sounding in your ears, "Prepare to meet thy God." "I stand at the door and knock."

II.—Now let us mark the attention with which we should regard these words. The Divine Speaker prefixes the word "Behold" to the announcement, "I stand at the door and knock." Wherever you read this word "behold" in Scripture, it is intended to call your attention to something striking or wonderful, as, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." "Behold He prayeth." "Behold He cometh with clouds." So here, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," is intended to fix your eyes on an object that merits your deep attention.

Behold, then, this sight, and see therein the wonderful *condescension* of Him who thus stands and knocks. For who is this?

> Knocking, knocking, who is there,
> Waiting, waiting, oh, how fair!
> 'Tis a Pilgrim, strange and kingly,
> Never such was seen before.

Yes, it is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, who thus stands and knocks at the door of the sinner's heart. The King at the door of His subject. The Author and Giver of every good and perfect gift at the door of the beggar's house! See the description of Him in the 14th verse: "These things saith the Amen the faithful and true witness, the beginning (or the beginner) of the creation of God." "For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth, and by Him all things exist" (Col. i. 16). It is He who thus in the exercise of condescending, compassionate love, comes and stands at the door of the sinner's heart. Oh, how wonderful! And yet not wonderful, for it is so like Him, "Who, though he was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 6). Oh, brethren, behold Him in the days of His humiliation on earth, see Him as a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, when He exclaimed, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." See Him in the garden of Gethsemane when "His sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground." Behold Him on the Cross when in the hour of the dark and dread desolation of His soul he exclaimed, "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken Me," and you will cease to marvel that He who thus humbled Himself unto death, even the death of the Cross, should thus stand and knock at the door of him for whom He shed His precious blood,

> Oh, my soul, for such a wonder,
> Wilt thou not undo the door.

But look again at the wonderful *patience* of Christ. I stand, He says, and knock. The word "stand" should rather be translated "I have stood," εστηκα, long had He stood at the door of the Laodicean Church, though "He knew her works" and her lukewarm indifference, and long has He stood and knocked at the door of the heart of some whom I address this night; and

God alone knows whether you have opened your heart to your Saviour and your God. Yes, to some He came in early youth while yet a child on your mother's lap. When folding your little hands together she taught you to pray, and in simple words told you the sweet story of Jesus's love; how He took up little children in His arms and blessed them, and said, "Of such is the Kingdom of God." Oh, did you not hear the voice of Jesus pleading with you then, knocking at the door of your heart? And did you not say, "I will be good—a child of Jesus"? But, alas! some of you have forgotten the first early impressions of piety, and have "walked no more with Jesus;" but He has not forgotten or forsaken you, for this night He stands and knocks at the door of your heart! Oh, the wonderful patience of Jesus! For He came again to you when grown from childhood to youth—perhaps when preparing for the holy rite of confirmation, or when that loving mother, who taught you your first prayer, was taken from you, and memory waked within your soul tender visions of the past, and recollections of vows made but forgotten, and then hearing the voice of Jesus pleading with you again, you said, "I will become the servant and the soldier of Jesus Christ." But you went out into the world, met with former companions, joined with them, it may be, in riotous living, and forgot your vows to your God and your Saviour. But He has not forgotten you; He still stands and knocks at the door of your heart.

Or, again, some there may be in this house of God who, having forgotten their vows made at confirmation, have gone forth into the world, and engaged in its occupations and business, and amid the pressure of its cares, or its trials, have pleaded to the call of Jesus, "I pray Thee have me excused." Yet the blessed Saviour has not cast you off, though you have "despised the riches of His goodness and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." Yet patient, He stands at the door of your heart this night and pleads for admittance.

Or, once more, there may be some here this night who have gone down into the vale of years—old, grey-headed men—of whom it may be said that "the almond tree flourisheth and the grasshopper is a burden, and desire faileth"; and all things seem to say that the hour is at hand when the silver cord shall be loosed and the golden bowl be broken, and the dust shall return to the earth, and the spirit shall return unto God, who gave it. And yet it may be (I speak to you with affectionate earnestness) that even at this, the eleventh hour, you still stand idle in the market-place pleading that "No man hath hired me." O, sirs, this night the loving Saviour once more pleads with you: "Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right that shall ye receive."

But behold, again, the *goodness* as well as the patience of the Blessed Saviour, for what says He: "If any man hear My voice and open the door I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me." He wants to bless you with the fulness of His presence and endearing love. He wants to satisfy every longing desire of your soul, so that leaning on His breast, as did the disciple of old, you may catch the whisperings of His love. "If any man hear My voice" none are shut out, "Any man" may hear His voice, and "open the door," but here, I seem to hear some one objecting and pleading, "I cannot open the door, my heart is closed, and it is God's prerogative to open the heart, as He did the heart of Lydia of old. I wish He would open my heart, for I cannot." Now, I would say to you, my friend, beware of objecting instead of believing; remember what the Scripture saith, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish." God's *commands* always presuppose God's *promises*. If He says "open the door" instead of disputing, make the effort, draw back the bolts and bars of prejudice, sin, and unbelief, and He will give you the power to open the door. "Stretch forth thy hand," said the Lord of old to the man with the withered arm, who instead of disputing and explaining that his arm was withered, and he could not stretch it forth, "he did so" in obedience to his Lord's command, and in doing so he received strength to obey the Lord's command. And so He says this night, "If any man open the door, I will come in to him and sup with him—in the great feast of the Gospel—in the holy ordinance of the Lord's Supper, in the which he shall feed upon Me in his heart by faith with thanksgiving; and I will invite Him to sit down at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb where 'they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.'"

But observe the *attitude* of our Lord as He knocks at the door of the sinner's heart. He says, "I *stand* at the door and knock," He does not say "I sit," but "I stand." He has not taken up His abode there. He almost intimates that He is on the move, like a man with his hand on the knocker; He is just ready to depart. The night is cold, and there is no response from within. This may be the last time you will even hear His voice pleading with you for admittance. Oh, harden not your hearts in this the day of His grace. For "Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they which pierced Him and rejected the offers of His mercy, and closed the door of their hearts against Him, 'shall wail because of Him,' calling upon the rocks and mountains to hide them from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, 'for the great day of His wrath is come, and who shall be able to abide it?'" But unto you, my beloved brethren, that fear and

love His name—unto you shall "the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in His wings." The clouds and mists of earth shall flee away before the bright beams of the rising sun; you shall "see the King in his beauty"; you "shall be like Him, for you shall see Him as He is," and enter into that glorious city, "the streets of which are of pure gold," where, in the language of that beautiful anthem which you have heard sung this night, "You shall need no more the light of the sun by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give thee light; for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and thy God thy glory."

ALWAYS REJOICING.

By the Rev. CHARLES W. GANLY, M.A., Rector of Castledermot, and Chaplain to the Duke of Leinster.

Sermon Preached in His Grace the Duke of Leinster's Private Chapel, on the Second Sunday after Epiphany.

"Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice."—Phil. iv. 4.
"Rejoice evermore."—1 Thess. v. 16.

The Saviour cannot pass away,
And with Him lives our joy.—Keble.

As in the teaching of our blessed Lord there is a breadth, a comprehensiveness which is destructive to the narrowness which is natural to fallen human nature, so in Christianity, unlike other religions which are one-sided, there is a comprehensive all-embracing character; it takes a wide scope and reaches out to every relation of our being and touches every part of human character—whatever it finds good there it purifies and ennobles, whatever is evil it drives out and destroys. This religion which we profess takes possession of our ordinary capacities and affections, and whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any praise, if there be any virtue, it presses all into the holy service of God.

It is one of the distinguishing characteristics of true and vital religion that it exhibits itself in every variation of life, in our work as well as in our worship, in our joys as much as in our sorrows—so it teaches us "to rejoice with them that do rejoice, and to weep with them that weep." This wide catholicity of Christian teaching is too often overlooked and forgotten. For example, we are quite willing to recognise the advantages, the efficacy, the softening and soothing influence of religion in times of trouble and sorrow—indeed, persons have been known to pray when great danger was impending to life or property who never really prayed before—when all earthly hope is over and death stares one in the face, then the consolations of Christianity are eagerly sought, and at such times even the most worldly consider that it is wisdom to turn to God for help. Then that religion which weeps with them that weep is felt to be worth seeking; but is it not sometimes forgotten that the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ sympathises with our joys as it does with our sorrows, and that it has to do with the home where there is gladness and rejoicing as it has its mission to the home where there is sadness or pain, or trouble, or mourning? Yes, our holy religion touches every relation of life, and enters into every enterprise and joy, and, by its elevating and purifying influence, enables us to range ourselves among those who are "always rejoicing."

Our great Exemplar taught us, by His own example when on earth, that He desired to encourage and purify our earthly joys. No doubt we are accustomed to think of Him as "the Man of Sorrows"; we know the larger part of His life-work was engaged with the sufferings and trials of men. We delight to meditate with awe and reverence over His own great sufferings and His death of agony and shame, because they speak home to our hearts of sin atoned and pardon secured. We learn much of the sympathising love of the Lord Jesus when we read of His weeping near the sepulchre of His departed friend, and of His shedding tears of patriotic sympathy over sinful Jerusalem, so soon to be made waste and desolate; but we shall lose much that He intends us to possess if we fail to see the other side of His perfect character, when He is presented to our notice and admiration as sympathising with the earthly enjoyments, the times of rejoicing, of those about Him. When we inquire, then, had "the Man of Sorrows" any joys, we find our inquiry fully answered when we know how He rejoiced in making others happy. A beautiful example of this is presented for our instruction at the beginning of His ministry, when He gave His first display of power and glory at the marriage feast of Cana. Underneath this miracle there lies a deep well of instruction. We not only learn the Divine power of our Lord, but we recognise this special sanction of those tender connections which give the greatest interest to life, and which in this case He "adorned and beautified" with His approving presence. We learn that marriage can have no real blessing without Him. "*In Christo et Ecclesiâ* that begins all, and there is great need it should be so, for they that enter into a state of marriage cast a die of the greatest contingency, and yet of the greatest interest in the world, next to the last throw for eternity." * But beyond these lessons we further see how He can sympathise with the joys of human life by His turning the water into wine, for our Lord thus sup-

* Bp. Jer. Taylor's "Marriage Ring," Part I.

plies a want which was felt, and probably could not otherwise be procured owing to the poverty of the host. Yet wine was a thing which could very well be left out: it was not absolutely necessary; it was not really needed to nourish their bodies or sustain life. Wine, however, He graciously provided, and in large abundance, and thus of His own free will and goodness granted that which merely added to their pleasure and delight, and fell in with the customary rejoicing of such feasts. So He taught us how He desires to be with us and join in our happy moments, in our innocent pleasures and recreations and pleasures, in our prosperity and blessing and joy. He Himself rejoices in our joy. This is the spirit He infused into Christianity—a spirit of joy, a spirit of love, of kindness, of generosity; a feeling of sympathy and benevolence; a spirit which abhors all that defiles society and outrages peace, a spirit ever ready to avoid evil and choose the good.

> "The quality of mercy is not strained;
> It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven upon
> the place beneath;
> It is twice blessed;
> It blesseth him that gives and him that takes;
> 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest;
> It becomes the throned monarch better than his
> crown."

It is evident that the religion which we profess should present itself to all with whom we come in contact as a joyful religion; by their fruits the followers of Christ are to be recognised, and one of the fruits of the Spirit is joy. If we desire to give practical proof of what our religion is, we must see that it has a joyful effect on our own hearts and lives; if we are always downcast and dispirited, we bring disgrace on our belief. God never intended us to be always sombre and gloomy—sinfulness might well make us sad and miserable, but true Christian living reverses the feelings produced by sinful courses, and the Christian life must always be the happiest and brightest of all lives, for it is he who can rejoice in the Lord whose rejoicing is the most constant and lasting.

Why should we always rejoice? Joy is the passion or emotion excited by the acquisition or expectation of good, and we have both; we have present good, and we have bright and glorious hopes of better things yet to come. The Sweet Singer of Israel raises his highest notes of praise when he rejoices in the "salvation of God," and the same old Psalms of David still express the praises of Christians. How like the words in the thirty-fifth Psalm, "My soul shall be joyful in the Lord, it shall rejoice in Thy salvation," are to the words of the Christian hymn, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." This is the foundation of all our rejoicing, the salvation of God. God our Saviour has been revealed to us, neither is there salvation in any other. Through faith in His name we obtain pardon for our sins; through Him alone we have access to the Father and the throne of grace; by Him we receive the spirit of truth; and, therefore, in accepting Christ Jesus and the salvation He freely offers "without money and without price," we find "all peace and joy in believing." Yes, we "worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."

Is there not great cause for our rejoicing in Him, our adorable Saviour, who left the throne of glory and the company of angels and archangels, and came and dwelt among sinful men, that He might do them good. Have we not every reason to rejoice when we remember His glorious example of meekness and goodness and love; and do we not find His joy remaining with us when we are enabled by His grace, even in the least degree, to follow that holy example? Beyond and above all, are we not constrained to rejoice when we remember Gethsemane and Calvary; when we call to mind the agony and blood-shedding of the Lord Jesus, who suffered there the Just for the unjust; when we recollect that He died for you and for me; when the glad tidings of redeeming love come home to our souls, and we know that "by His stripes we are healed"; that by His one all-atoning sacrifice He can present us pure and spotless, all "whiter than snow," before the judgment throne. Oh! as we let our faith rest only on the Rock of Ages, how shall we find expression for our rejoicing? Shall we not join with the apostle and say—"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." Yes, this is the procuring cause of all Christian joy, and so the rejoicing of the Christian is superior to all earthly joy, for he rejoices in the Lord always. Earthly joys are in their very nature transitory and changeable, and frequently are alloyed with trouble; spiritual joy is eternal, and, therefore, when we are bidden to rejoice we are exhorted to rejoice always, to "rejoice evermore." This joy is permanent and lasting; even when all earthly joys which were purified by it are ended, the rejoicing in the Lord will go on—on for ever. The joys of heaven are the eternal songs of praise to the Lamb of God; and when the work of life here is ended, those who have trusted and loved and served Christ shall enter into heaven's joy—the joy of their Lord.

You know how often it occurs in our earthly happiness that those who desire to injure us, or the great enemy of our souls, can mar our best-devised plans and destroy our brightest hopes; but in the joy that Jesus gives this cannot take place. The rejoicing which we have in the Lord is beyond the power of man, or Satan, or circumstance; no power of earth or hell can destroy the peace and joy of the faithful servant of Christ. This is one of the most important features in Christian joy; it is not of man, and it cannot be undone. Some-

times it may be brighter and more glowing than at other times, and by contrast we will feel occasionally that there is very little of it stirring our hearts and beautifying our lives; yet we are distinctly taught that, however faint and weak, the gift that is in us may appear, if we only "stir it up" as the apostle directs, we shall again go on our way rejoicing. Remember, then, that this spiritual joy remains on for ever in the heart of him who has given himself to God, as it is God's gift and eternal. If it be yours, no one can deprive you of it, for He has attached His promise to it—"Your joy no man taketh from you."

Undoubtedly even the most faithful and loving disciple of Christ may meet with sad trials and sorrows; there are many thorns and briars in the way to heaven—disappointments, bereavements, pain, sickness, disease, and death are the lot of all men, and the follower of Christ must expect his share of these; but in addition there are trials of faith, temptations, doubts, and despondencies which are less or more met with by all who love God and seek to please Him. How, then, when these come, can we rejoice? We may even in the midst of these find the wondrous power of Christian joy. When the apostles met with cruel persecution and trouble, "they rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His name." St. Peter, in his first epistle, when speaking of a great coming trouble, writes:—"Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you; but rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when His glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." Under trial and suffering the Christian has the example of Christ Himself, who "for the joy set before Him endured the cross." He also encouraged His disciples to endure trials and persecutions, and to rejoice under them:—"Rejoice ye in that day (the day of trouble and trial) and leap for joy, for great is your reward in heaven." This, then, is the manner in which we are to meet the afflictions of life, "as sorrowful yet always rejoicing," knowing that beyond these there is the crown of joy awaiting us, and that when these troubles and sorrows of earth have passed away, like bright sunshine after a rainy and dark day, we shall "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." Let us ever keep before us as the end and aim of our aspirations the eternal joys of heaven: this is the ambition of the Christian life, "to enter into the joy of the Lord." Is this to be our hope and crown of rejoicing? What will not the ambition of this world sacrifice to the future—the vague, uncertain, perishable future? With an object of interest in view and a prospect of obtaining it, men endure days of toil and nights of unrest—no suffering is too much, no sacrifice is too great; set but a scheme of future bliss before them, and the present is all absorbed. Without an object, without a prospect, ease itself is insupportable; possession satiates, and the soul sickens and languishes. Now, we have a glorious future opened up to us: "In Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand are pleasures for evermore." This is a future, near, sufficient, certain; in greatness above the sublimest flight of intellect; in bliss beyond imagination's stretch, for "it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive what God has prepared for them that love Him." Yet this prospect is there; a vision ever bright to the eyes of the faithful servant of God, earnestly waited for, anxiously expected.

Let our life, then, be one of rejoicing; let us ever rejoice in the love of Jesus, in the salvation of God; let us rejoice because our joy is eternal and no man can take it from us; let us rejoice under trials and chastisements, knowing that our sorrow shall be turned into joy; and let us make all our earthly rejoicings foretastes of those great rejoicings when we shall be permitted to sit down at "the marriage supper of the Lamb."

"Look up, my soul, pant towards the eternal hills;
Those heavens are fairer than they seem;
There pleasures all sincere glide on in crystal rills,
There not a dreg of guilt defiles,
Nor grief disturbs the stream;
That Canaan knows no noxious thing,
No cursed soil, no tainted spring,
No roses grow on thorns, nor honey wears a sting."

THE *Berkshire Chronicle* says that by the preferment of the Rev. J. O. Johnston, of All Saints', to the vicarage of Cuddesdon, Oxford, is threatened with the loss of one of her oldest churches, for the Corporation Act of 1890 provided that the parishes of All Saints' and St. Martin's, Carfax, should be united on the first vacancy occurring in either.

WITH the passing of the old year Oxford lose the services of Sir Henry Acland, who has resigned from this date the Regius Professorship of Medicine. As some acknowledgment of his many services, professional and other, to Oxford, it is proposed to collect £10,000 and enlarge the Acland Home. The proposal is an admirable one. The Acland Home has been a real godsend to many in Oxford, and its enlargement is a most fitting testimonial, both to a Professor of Medicine and to Sir Henry Acland.

THE *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* says that the vicarage of Dore, vacant by the death of the Rev. J. T. F. Aldred, has been offered by Earl Fitzwilliam to the Rev. W. R. Gibson, senior curate of Christ Church, Pitsmoor, by whom it has been accepted. Mr. Gibson, after being curate at St. Saviour's, Nottingham, and at Dorking, was preferred to the chaplaincy of the Thames Church Mission, where he laboured for seven years amongst passengers, emigrants, sailors, and soldiers. He was finally obliged to leave the rough river work, because the winters were to trying. In 1892 the Rev. S. Chorlton offered him the curacy of Pitsmoor, where he has since remained, having latterly acted as Mr. Chorlton's deputy at the Fir Vale Workhouse.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1895.

1894-1895.

ONCE more we have to welcome the coming and speed the parting year. Of 1894 many summaries have been written and read by this time. It has been memorable for many reasons, some of which fall within the scope of this article, while some must be excluded. With political doings, pure and simple, it is not our part to deal, neither may we discuss the interesting events which 1894 has brought about in royal houses. But there are exceptions. The birth of an heir to the throne, in direct male line, of the fourth generation. is something phenomenal. The murder of the head of the French nation, President Carnot, is also an event too rare, happily, to escape notice. It is now thirteen years since such a tragedy took place, and then, strangely enough, the blows fell impartially upon the autocrat Alexander II. and the President of the United States, General Garfield.

The retirement of Mr. Gladstone from political life is memorable. We have not yet realised all it means. Facts seem to point to a general break-up, in consequence, of our present political combinations. For eight years and more the name of Gladstone stood for a whole party, which was held together entirely by his influence, vaguely suggesting a policy which his adherents were ready to take on trust, so long as he remained the inspiring force and the ready reference. His withdrawal has left his former party in a situation of darkness and uncertainty, from which none can tell how they will emerge. But it appears certain that fresh bearings must be taken before any real progress can be made in political affairs.

The war in the Far East and the agitation on the question of Armenian atrocities are not yet in a sufficiently advanced state for useful comment.

Turning to Church matters, in another column the long list of death vacancies is referred to. We need only say here that the remarkable feature about the run of ecclesiastical patronage which has fallen to Lord Rosebery is the way in which he has looked after his friends and political adherents. The Liberal Churchmen's Union has come to the front in a way which would have seemed rank jobbery to the Radical press if the patronage had been in other hands and exercised in another direction. This has been as marked in low places as in high, and at least two priests have found active exertions in the Radical cause immediately rewarded by preferment to Lord Chancellor's livings.

The introduction of a Bill for disestablishing and disendowing the Church in Wales marked a stage in English Church history. It was the opening of the attack upon the Church of England. We need not here refer to the motives which caused the selection of these four dioceses as the point of attack. The political conditions of Wales, as well as the activity of the Church in that quarter, sufficiently explain them. The Church of England in its entirety is the real objective. This has been fairly well understood, and in the struggle honours rest so far with the defenders of the Church. But it must also be well understood that this is only the beginning of the strife: the discussion on Mr. Asquith's Bill was, after all, only an affair of outposts. We are promised a new Bill for 1895: perhaps we shall then get more into the thick of it. For the Establishment 1895 may probably mark a crisis.

The Church Patronage Bill, after an exciting existence, died by suffocation in the House of Commons. For some reasons this is not to be regretted. Certain of its proposals were confiscatory, and it was idle for men who supported them to protest against disendowment as confiscation. Reforms in patronage cry aloud, and must come at no distant date, but they were not altogether happily conceived in this particular Bill.

Parish Councils have been introduced in 1894 as a new feature for Church organisation to reckon with. It cannot be denied that there was, in some quarters, a hope that they would prove hostile to the Church, and the Radical press endeavoured, therefore, to show that the leaders of the Church were hostile to them. This has been belied. The Bishops and clergy were by no means unfavourable to the idea of Parish Councils, and the result of the Council elections, as far as may be judged, seems to show that the operation of the Parish Councils will not be prejudicial to the interests of the Church.

The action of the Archbishop of Dublin in consecrating a Bishop for the Spanish Reformers, and the consequent steps taken by the E.C.U., are referred to in another place.

A feature in the religious hisiory of 1894 is the curious conduct of Cardinal Vaughan, who has assumed an aggressive attitude towards the Church of the land which gives him hospitality which was never taken up by his great predecessors. The motives of the Cardinal we do not pretend to fathom, especially as his peculiar action synchronises with a more sympathetic attitude of Continental Roman Catholics towards us. While the Cardinal is strenuously denying us any of the Notes of the Church, Continental students have been examining such questions as those of Anglican Orders in a very different spirit to that manifested before. There are clear signs that some of the best theologians of the Church of France do not consider us such hopeless schismatics as Cardinal Vaughan asserts we are.

But this is all part of a singular revival among all religious bodies of interest in one another. In Rome Leo XIII. has been aiming at a *rapprochement* with the Eastern churches. At Grindelwald the "Re-union" Conference attracted more attention than in previous years. At Exeter the Church Congress was a brilliant and phenomenal success. All Europe over religious-minded people, who have no political axes to grind, seem to be aiming at some mutual understanding, or, at least, mutual acquaintance.

This is connected with another conspicuous movement on the part of religious bodies in the direction of social reform. The world begins to demand practical Christianity, and that all ministers of religion should be ministers of public weal. Our National Church displays a great access of vigour in responding to the appeal. Perhaps the most conspicuous feature in the religious and social history of 1894 is Education, and its developments. We have had the School Board controversy in London—now, we hope, laid to rest. We have also had remarkable progress in primary education all over the kingdom. The code has been harmonised, as far as possible, with public requirements, and the Education Laws have been administered so vigorously as to rouse suspicion of prejudice. The treatment of King's College, London, and the attempted spoliation of the Education Trusts of Ruthin, go far to justify this. But the Draconic severity with which the Voluntary Schools have been visited is probably a blessing in disguise. It has waked managers into energy and stirred supporters into enthusiasm. No system is healthy which cannot stand persecution. The Voluntary Schools have stood it well.

All these questions leave points of interest, and anxiety, for 1895. In matters religious, social and political it will be a year of struggle. Many problems are ripening for solution. It is another question whether opportunities of solution will come, for there are strong indications of political unsettlement. Parliament as at present constituted, is hardly capable of settling anything. And yet, it is not certain that 1895 will see a new one. The only, and perhaps the best, thing we can do is to hope.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE closing year has proved more fatal to dignitaries of the Church of England than any of its recent predecessors. Two English sees have been vacated by death—those of Bath and Wells and Hereford, the latter only on Christmas Eve. One Irish bishop, Dr. Reichel, of Meath, has died during the year, and two English suffragans, Dr. Blomfield, of Colchester, and Dr. Bowlby, of Coventry. The obituary includes also the name of one retired English prelate, Dr. Pelham, formerly Bishop of Norwich. The deans of Lincoln and Hereford have died, and the Dean of Durham resigned during the year.

Among colonial and missionary bishops there are some painful losses to record. The names of Bishop Smythies and of Bishop Hill and his wife have to be added to the African martyr-roll: and we have to record also the deaths of Bishop Linton, of Riverina, and Bishop Sillitoe, of New Westminster. Among well-known clergymen of lesser degree who have passed away during 1894 may be mentioned Canon Rowsell, Canon Prothero, the Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, Canon Lord Forester, the Rev. James Jackson (at 91), vicar of St. Sepulchre, in the City of London, and Canon Curteis, chaplain of the Savoy. The Mastership of the Temple has been resigned by Dean Vaughan, whose restoration to comparative health has been reasonably spoken of as almost miraculous.

The only English diocesan appointed during the year has been Dr. Kennion, translated from Adelaide to Bath and Wells; Hereford, of course, remains vacant. The new deans are Dr. Wickham, appointed to Lincoln, Dr. Stubbs to Ely, Canon Leigh to Hereford, and Prebendary Stephens to Winchester, the Dean of Winchester, Dr. Kitchin, having been translated to Durham. Canonries at Westminster have been conferred upon the Rev. Basil Wilberforce and the Rev. Charles Gore, and the vicar of Windsor, the Rev. Richard Gee, has succeeded Canon Courtenay at St. George's Chapel. The Mastership of the Temple has been conferred upon the Rev. Alfred Ainger, so many years the Reader there during Dr. Vaughan's Mastership.

Among the events of special interest to Churchmen which have happened this year must be mentioned the Pan-Anglican Missionary Conference, which was held at the end of May, and which afforded abundant evidence that Churchmen of different schools can cordially co-operate for the extension of Christianity in the heathen world. A collective Episcopal manifesto against disestablishment in Wales was issued early in the year. The Bishop of Worcester did not append his name, not because he differed from his brethren on the merits of the question, but because he doubted the expediency of the particular step. He has since, however, announced that his doubts have been removed, and that he desires to be considered

as in entire unison with the other members of the Episcopate. The Church Congress at Exeter was in every way a great success.

Some dissension has unhappily been caused by the opposing views taken of the action of the Archbishop of Dublin in consecrating a bishop for the Spanish reformers. That is a subject upon which diverse views may reasonably be held, but sober-minded Churchmen have been unable to approve the conduct of the English Church Union in sending, through its president, Lord Halifax, a humble apology to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo for Lord Plunket's act. It has been generally felt that, whether the consecration was right or wrong, the Church of England owes no apology to Rome, in view of the assumption of territorial jurisdiction in this country by Cardinal Vaughan and the other bishops appointed by the Pope.

The Christmas services in London this year have not, so far as we are aware, presented any feature of novelty. There is, perhaps, a growing tendency to dispense with evening services, while the Celebrations of Holy Communion in the earlier hours are multiplying. Four and five celebrations, from six to ten o'clock, are hardly an uncommon feature in churches where there is no advanced ritual. The observance of Christmas as a religious festival by Dissenters is undoubtedly far more common than it was. In most of the principal London chapels, not excepting those belonging to the Unitarians, there were services at least in the morning, with, in some cases, elaborate music, and more generally, perhaps, floral decorations.

Mr. Ellison's successor at St. Gabriel's, Pimlico, is the Rev. Rupert Hugh Morris, of Eaton Hall. Mr. Morris has been private chaplain and librarian to the Duke of Westminster, who is patron of the living, for the last ten years. He is a local archæologist, and has written a history of Chester. He was previously, for eight years, head master of the Godolphin School at Hammersmith.

The living of Aston, Birmingham, vacated by Canon Knox's promotion to a suffragan bishopric, is still going begging. The Rev. R. B. Ransford, the *Record* says, has found himself unable to accept it. He has since accepted the incumbency of St. Paul's, Norwood, vacant by the resignation of the Rev. W. H. Graham.

It will be heard with regret that Canon Body is suffering from a throat affection which prevents his preaching. In all probability he will attempt no preaching till Lent.

The deaths are reported of two clergymen, both of whom had achieved some literary reputation. The Rev. W. J. Blew, formerly incumbent of St. John's-next-Gravesend, who had attained the age of 86, was the author of "Translations from Homer (Books I. and II. of the Iliad)," "Frogs and Mice in Verse," "Agamemnon the King, in English Verse," "Breviarium Aberdonense," "Hymns and Hymn Books," and "The Lost Gospels"; and co-operated with Dr. Gauntlett in the production of "The Church Hymn and Tune Book." The Rev. W. J. Edge, formerly vicar of Holy Trinity, Upper Tooting, who died in his eighty-second year, was select preacher at the University of Cambridge in 1855, and was the author of numerous works, his principal contribution to theological literature being "The Second Adam," a course of lectures designed to illustrate the Divinity of our Lord and the Union of the Divine and Human Natures in His Sacred Person.

The honorary secretaries of the Bristol Bishopric Society have received £500 from a donor who wishes to be described as "Franciscus" towards the re-endowment of the See of Bristol. A similar amount was anonymously subscribed a few weeks ago by a lady who had intended to leave it as a legacy for the purpose. The sum raised since the Bishop of Truro's sermon in October last, on the anniversary of the Society, is £2,754. There still remains to be subscribed or guaranteed such an amount as will, at the expiration of five years, produce an annual income of £220 before an Order in Council can be made re-establishing the bishopric.

Testimonies multiply as to the rapid growth of the Church in Wales. Canon Venables, in a letter published a day or two ago, quotes a letter from the vicar of Swansea, the Rev. Canon Allan Smith, in which he said :—"You will be interested to know that I have just purchased in the parish two Nonconformist chapels. offered me by Nonconformists themselves." Canon Smith adds, "All the Church wants is time."

According to the *Year-book* for 1895 of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, the Church has now 303 working clergy; the incumbencies and missions number 314; parsonages, 128; Church population, 105,027; communicants, 39,831; baptised during the year, 7,827; confirmed during the year, 3,530; marriages during the year, 801; day schools, 80; day scholars, 15,037; Sunday scholars 17,450. The contributions to the principal funds administered by the Representative Church Council during the year amounted to £22,052.

The *Record* states that the progress made in the restoration of St. Saviour's, Southwark, has raised the question of the church's future. There is reason to believe that arrangements are in progress under which St. Saviour's will become a cathedral for South London, and such questions of patronage as may have been the cause of perplexity will be resolved in a way acceptable to all.

The Apostles' Creed has recently been introduced into the board schools at Warwick, the new school board having upon it a majority of Churchmen. A meeting has been held in the town under the presidency of "a working man magistrate" to denounce what is called denominational teaching. It does not seem to be pretended, however, as indeed it could hardly be, after the decision of the Education Department, that the teaching of the Creed is illegal. Some 250 parents, nevertheless, have availed themselves of the Conscience Clause to withdraw their children from the religious instruction in the schools. This is to be regretted, but such a possibility is no reason why the children of Church-going parents should not be taught the common creed of Christendom.

It is sometimes a good thing to see ourselves as others see us, and there is, unhappily, more truth than we could wish in Roman caricatures of the present condition of the Church of England. We can afford to laugh, however, at such a description of the Church as is furnished to the "Corriere di Napoli" by its correspondent at the Vatican. "The Anglican Church," says this veracious writer, "languishes in

indifferentism and despicable ritualistic controversies. It is not a body without a head, because the law imposes the headship on the Queen, but all the members of this infirm body move on their own lines. Every vicar does as he likes, every bishop is Pope in his own diocese, and the synods are nothing but useless academical meetings. Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, has recently said he did not recognise the Archbishop of Canterbury as the Primate of England, nor as his ecclesiastical superior."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CORRIGENDA.

SIR,—It is a pity that enthusiastic and eloquent sermons, such as those of the Rev. Canon Wilberforce in recent editions of your Journal, should be marred by definitions and statements which are at variance with the formularies of the Church of England and with the Word of God.

Thus, in his sermon on Mark x. 30, he says: "On this earth, in this sphere of human trial, the communion of saints . . . . . is the union of souls; it is not the rapture of the aristocracy of grace confined to a select few, it is the solidarity of the unsaved many, pleading for your help; it is the common bond of humanity arising from a common life inherited from a common Father" (CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT, p. 268). Now surely it requires no great knowledge of Church teaching or of Bible doctrine to see that the communion of saints is *not* "the union of souls, the solidarity of the unsaved many." The Church of Christ (ἐκκλησία) is *called out* from the world, and the very purpose of the Christian dispensation is to take out of the Gentiles a people for God's Name (Acts xv. 14), and to secure the elect remnant of the Jews (Rom. xi. 5). But the Canon practically identifies the Church with the world in his explanation of the communion of saints.

Again, both in this sermon and that published last week, he fails to distinguish the two aspects of Divine Sonship: "Let but the knowledge of the universal sonship of the race . . . . . once prevail, and the world would need no other theology" (PULPIT, p. 291). True, all men are sons of God in the sense in which St. Paul, quoting from the Greek poet Aratus, described them in his sermon at Athens: "For we are also His offspring" (Acts xvii. 28). But the same Apostle says also of what is certainly not a universal sonship: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 26); and, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God" (Rom. viii. 14). St. John recognises this spiritual sonship when he says: "As many as received Him (the Word) to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name" (John i. 12). Moreover, the Great Teacher Himself shows us that there is quite a different sonship for us to recognise in our survey of this sinful world when, in the parable of the Tares, he distinguishes between "the children of the kingdom" and "the children of the wicked one" (Matt. xiii. 38).

This loose theology leads naturally and necessarily to Universalism, and so we read in the Canon's second sermon that for "the children of men . . . . . to be for ever with the Lord . . . . . is their ultimate destiny" (PULPIT, p. 290). This, again, is not the teaching of the Church of England or of the Word of God. The Confession of our Christian Faith, recited in church to-day, and the New Testament lessons (Rev. xx.-xxi. 1-15), which will be read in our churches next Sunday, tell a very different tale. The everlasting punishment of the wicked, whatever it may consist of—as, for instance, a kind of penal servitude—will, no doubt, answer the ends of Divine government, and will be quite consistent with the character of the God Who is Love and Whose mercy endureth for ever. But to hazard the opinion that the portion of the saints (1 Thess. iv. 17) is to be the lot of all men is to set aside the plain teaching of the Prayer Book and the Bible.

Writing as one of the ordained ministers of the Church of England, I venture to protest against such doctrine, and to say that as long as we are the authorised exponents of revealed truth in the Church of England our preaching and teaching should be in harmony with the doctrine of the Book of Common Prayer and of the Word of God.

A.M. OXON.

Hereford, Christmas Day, 1894.

DISESTABLISHMENT *V.* TITHES.

SIR,—The thorn in the flesh is the payment of tithes, and if the Church wishes to save disestablishment she must sacrifice them now and so secure her other property.

It is no use to point out her legal claims, which, if we were all good Christians, we might acknowledge, for does not the Bible tell us that all should pay tithe of all that they possess? but, though this may have been done in ages past, when the land was the only income, it was a Clerical State Act, and is not now so exacted with regard to all sources of wealth. It is, therefore, looked upon as an incidence of taxation upon the land only, and very many small landowners, and especially Nonconformists, will not vote for disestablishment if they do not vote against it, and the recent parish council elections demonstrate the power of the latter.

As a Churchman I say I think tithes compulsorily exacted are contrary to the spirit of our religion, and that all we give should be given freely. It is useless to argue that they are not our own. If they are not, take them once and for all, as if you can redeem them the wound will soon be forgotten. Whatever has been given and is now held by the Church, like glebe and other lands, would never be sought after, even in Wales, if the tithe was cast overboard and a voluntary sustentation fund raised in its place; for without the votes of the aggrieved tithepayers the Dissenting avaricious ones would be nowhere.

I think the money now being raised for Church defence would be better spent in so bringing peace instead of war, and I would gladly give much more than my tithe is worth to such a fund, and, doubtless, others would so redeem their tithe.

A LAYMAN.

December 26th, 1894.

THE Rev. Edward Dakin has resigned the charge of Kingstanley Baptist Church, Stroud, which he has held for nearly twelve years, with a view to take holy orders in the Church of England. Mr. Dakin was trained at Regent's Park College. The church at Kingstanley is said to be the oldest Baptist community in Gloucestershire, the year 1640 being claimed as the date of its foundation.

THE *Church Missionary Intelligencer* states that the Rev. A. H. Arden, "who for the past thirteen years has worked most zealously and fruitfully on our home staff, part of the time as an honorary association secretary, has returned for the third time to the Mission-field. He went out first, soon after graduating at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1864, and gave nine years of service in the Telugu Mission. After coming home in 1873 he held several Engish cures, being vicar in succession of All Saints', Sudbury, and of Newhall, Burton-on-Trent. In 1877 he went out a second time, with a view to returning to the Telugu Mission, but when he reached Madras the exigencies of the work required his taking up the responsible work of the secretaryship of the corresponding committee and the South India Mission. It is to this post that he now goes forth once more, in order to relieve the Rev. E. Sell, who is about to take a needed furlough."

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Temptation. "Who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. iv. 15). Introduction.—The great Apostle here brings before our notice the rest and satisfaction we may find in the power of God's Word by our High Priest Jesus, the Son of God, Who was subject to infirmities and knew what pain and bodily endurance were, yet without sin. The Apostle encourages the saints, that they may find rest and solace in Christ, our High Priest. Such a Saviour, such an elder brother, Who has passed through a long catalogue of sufferings and endurance of trials for us, that we may rest assured how tenderly He watches over His people and cares for them in all their chequered history in this world. He is just the Friend we need: "For we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Therefore, to give us more confidence, the Apostle tells us to "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need." How important, then, in all our troubles and temptations they may be overcome by our earnest faith and prayer in our great High Priest. Temptations come more or less to the believer; Satan is ever seeking whom he may overcome. There are many attractions in the world to allure and draw us away from the simplicity of the faith. But all these things are pointed out to us to beware of, and not to be overcome by their external attractions. Jesus here is our great model, our great exemplar, our great pattern, looking to Him in all our trials and under all circumstances, wherever we may be placed by the providence of God, knowing that all things will work together for good to those that love the Lord Jesus Christ. He knows what we can bear, and His strength will enable us to overcome the greatest trials upon earth. We may apply a few practical inferences from this subject:—1. Jesus was subject to temptation and pain. 2 Jesus overcame temptation. 3. Jesus our great Succourer. 4. Jesus our only High Priest. 5. Jesus our perfect example.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

THE Rev. Dr. Thompson, rector of St. Saviour's, Southwark, writes that the report that that church is to become a cathedral at the beginning of the year is premature; nor has the rector surrendered any of his rights. The restoration of the fabric will not be complete until the spring of 1896.

THE Gospeller at the ordination in Durham Cathedral on St. Thomas's Day (the Rev. A. H. Parry) was really second on the list of the candidates, but out of regard for the work he had done for the Church prior to his ordination, the Bishop chose him to read the Gospel.—*Record.*

MR. MAKEPEACE, one of the oldest of the lay clerks of Rochester Cathedral, has just completed half a century of service there. Cathedral life, indeed, seems frequently to be associated with lengthy service, and as one conspicuous example it may be mentioned that Dr. W. H. Longhurst, now organist of Canterbury, has, as choir-boy, vicar choral, and organist, been a member of the musical staff of the Cathedral since 1828.

THE Rev. J. Armitage Robinson, B.D., of Christ's College, Cambridge, has been collated by the Bishop and afterwards duly installed as a Prebendary in Wells Cathedral, taking the stall of Compton Bishop, formerly held by the late Prebendary Philpott. After the ceremony the usual peal on the cathedral bells was rung. Prebendary Robinson, Norrisian Professor of Divinity of Cambridge, is a native of Somerset, having been born at Keynsham, where his father was many years vicar. He was one of the examining chaplains to the late Bishop and has been appointed to the same post by the present Bishop.

IN the notes from the East London district, in the *London Diocesan Magazine* it is stated that a month ago the income of the E.L.C.F. was £500 less than that of last year to the same date. "At last, however, we are able to record an increase. A comparison between 1893 and 1894 still shows a difference of £400, but this difference, we are thankful to say, is now on the right side As we go to press, the receipts for the year are £17,400. £1,000 more is needed, if we are to surpass the income of 1893, the largest on record, and to meet our liabilities on December 31st. We hope that the friends of the E.L.C.F. will see that this amount, at least, is forthcoming before the year's accounts are closed." The following letter, sent by a poor woman to one of the clergy of the district who had preached in his own church for the fund is a touching instance of self-denial:—"Dear Vicar,—The enclosed is a small offering I wish to be sent to the East London Church Fund. If it is not troubling you, would you kindly forward it. It is what I should have spent on myself, but after hearing your sermon on Sunday last it is freely given." 8s. was enclosed.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.—The last day of the year shows that the net receipts for the year 1894 for the general fund of the Missions to Seamen, exclusive of legacies, loans, building funds, and of monies raised and expended locally at the sixty-four stations at home and abroad, are £5,000 more than those of the previous year. The London fund of the Missions to Seamen, being insufficient to meet the expenditure on maintenance of the two seamen's institutes opened in 1894 for the Port of London, and the staff of three chaplains and six lay workers appointed thereto, has had to come upon the general fund, these outlays in-

creasing the mission expenditure considerably. Nevertheless, the past year has closed with a moderate credit balance, which will go towards meeting this increased maintenance expenditure in the coming year. The support thus liberally given to the additional efforts made last year by the Missions to Seamen to meet the needs of sailors may be regarded as satisfactory for the present, though the increased liabilities for the coming year are not free from anxiety to the committee of management.

At St. Edmund's, Lombard Street, on the 23rd ult., the Rev. Canon Benham preached an eloquent sermon on "The Peace of God." Having traced the warlike spirit through the history of the chosen people, and even into the Christian era, he asked, where then is this white robed peace of which the angels sang? Not in the palaces of kings, nor in the cottage, nor (he grieved to say) is it to be found in the Church. At Christmas, above every season, this question ought to press on the hearts and consciences of thinking men. The nations are longing to wake up from their horrible dream of mutual distrust. Forty years ago, at Christmastide he read the noblest of all John Bright's speeches, delivered after the battles of Alma and Inkerman, and that speech praised the courage and endurance of our soldiers. But what a Christmas night it was! There was hardly a village in England which was not in mourning. And though no Englishman could do otherwise than praise the courage and endurance of our soldiers, we are now all agreed that that war was an error, and might have been avoided. He believed in the mission of the Peace Society. We could read in cold blood of the war between China and Japan, but what can we say or think about Christian men in Europe going about armed to the teeth? So long, of course, as it was said that "war is necessary," this state of things would continue to shock us, but the lessons of the Prince of Peace must ever be commended to the prayers of the people.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Askwith, Rev. Charles, B.A.; Vicar of Christ Church, St. Albans,

Atkinson, Rev. R. L., M.A., Senior Curate of Lancaster; Perpetual Curate of Overton, Lancaster.

Atkins, Rev. Lancelot White, M.A.; Vicar of St. Cross, otherwise Holy Rood, Winchester.

Barrington, Rev. Ythil A., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary-le-Tower, Ipswich; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Baxter, Rev. William, Curate of St. John's, Workington, and St. Mary's, Westfield; Vicar of Barrow-cum-Twyford, Derbyshire.

Bicknell, Rev. C. V., Curate; Vicar of St. Michael's, St. Albans.

Buckley, Rev. J. C., Vicar of St. Luke's, Victoria Docks; Honorary Canon of St. Alban's Cathedral.

Collyns, Rev. C. B., Curate of Stoke; Vicar of Plymstock, Devonshire.

De Vine, Rev. W. T., M.A., Vicar of Oulton, Stone; Vicar of Tipton, Staffs.

Fawcett, Rev. F. L'Estrange, M.A., Vicar of Stowmarket; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Gibson, Rev. William Ralph, Curate of Pitsmoor, Sheffield; Vicar of Dore, Sheffield.

Hall, Rev. Henry Owen, Vicar of Earsdon, Northumberland; Vicar of Benwell, Newcastle.

Hyson, Rev. J. B., Vicar of Tintinhull; Rector of Yeovilton, Somerset.

Johnson, Right Rev. Henry Frank, LL.B., Bishop-Suffragan of Colchester; Archdeacon of Colchester.

Johnson, Rev. Philip B., B.A.; Superintendent of the Dublin Branch of the Irish Church Missions.

Johnston, Rev. John Octavius, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Oxford; Vicar of Cuddesdon.

Jones, Rev. David, B.A., Rector of Llanfair; Vicar of Dwygyfylchi-w-Penmaenmawr, Conway.

Kemm, Rev. Thomas, lately Curate of Hessenford, Cornwall; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury, as in Charge of the Donative Parish of Easton Royal, Wilts.

Locke, Rev. W. J., M.A., Vicar of Overton; Vicar of Caton, Lancaster.

Mackenzie, Rev. James Wilson Alexander, M.A.; Vicar of Whitwick, Lancaster.

Maclachlan, Rev. Archibald Campbell, M.A.; Vicar of Newton Valence, Alton, Hants.

Mitchell, Rev. J. H., Curate of Low Fell, Gateshead; Vicar of Coalville, Leicester.

Moore, Rev. P. H., Vicar of Chadkirk, Stockport; Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.

Newby, Rev. John Edward, Curate; Rector of Pilton, Oundle.

Newby, Rev. John Edward, Curate; Rector of Wadenhoe, Oundle.

Penny, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Vicar of Tunstall; Rural Dean of Hanley.

Ransford, Rev. R. B., M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, East Brixton; Vicar of St. Paul's, Upper Penge, Surrey.

Roberts, Rev. W. M., M.A.; Association Secretary for C.M.S. in the Diocese of St. Asaph and part of St. David's.

Robinson, Rev. J. Armitage, B.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; Prebendary of Wells Cathedral, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Royds, Rev. F. C., M.A., Rector of Coddington, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.

Scholfield, Rev. Daniel, Vicar of Wyresdale; Honorary Secretary of the Church Army in the Deanery of Lancaster.

Stuart, Rev. H. V., M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Wolverhampton; Vicar of Cannock, Stafford.

Swayne, Rev. W. S., M.A., Vicar of Walsall; Rural Dean of Walsall.

Talbot, Rev. Arthur Henry, M.A., Rector of Church Eaton; Rural Dean of Stafford.

Thomas, Rev. Ernest Winthrop, A.K.C.; Vicar of Irchester, Wellingborough.

Waller, Rev. E. H. M.; Assistant-Chaplain at St. John's Hall, Highbury.

Warlow, Rev. George Edmund, B.A., Curate of St. Anne's, Wycombe Marsh; Vicar of Stockingford, Warwickshire.

Weston, Rev. Cecil Edward, B.A., Curate; Rector of Thorpe Achurch-cum-Lilford, Oundle.

Wodehouse, Rev. Armine; Rector of Chelmondiston, Ipswich.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Atlay, Rev. James, D.D., Lord Bishop of Hereford, at the Palace, Hereford, on the 24th ult., aged 77.

Blew, Rev. W. J., M.A., at 6, Warwick-street, Pall-mall, on the 27th ult., aged 86.

Crosthwaite, Rev. Samuel Maitland, at Carlisle Grammar-school, on the 28th ult., aged 50.

Edge, Rev. William John, M.A., formerly Vicar of Holy Trinity, Upper Tooting, Vicar of Benenden, Kent, and Rector of Waldringfield, Suffolk, at Combe Martin House, Upper Tooting, on the 26th ult., aged 82.

Heartley, Rev. Charles T., M.A., Rector, and formerly for eighteen years Head Master of Bishop Gore's Grammar-school, Swansea, at Cheveley Rectory, near Newmarket, on the 16th ult., aged 71.

Hey, Rev. Robert, M.A., sixteen years Vicar of St. Andrew's, Derby, at Derby, on the 30th ult., aged 48.

Hooper, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Upton and Vicar of Aston Upthorpe, at Upton Rectory, on the 23rd ult., aged 73.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"BUYING UP THE OPPORTUNITY."

By the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Canon of Westminster and Vicar of Radley.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford on the Second Sunday in Advent, 1894.

"See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil. (Look then carefully how ye walk, not as unwise but as wise; buying up the opportunity because the days are evil. R.V.)"—Eph. v. 15.

"SEE that ye walk circumspectly, the days are evil." What is this but the often-repeated admonition of timorous, faint-hearted counsellors? "The days are evil; there are so many dangerous tendencies abroad; so many pitfalls even where things look secure enough upon the surface; such a spirit of restlessness everywhere. Do not, I implore you, commit yourself in a hurry. See that you walk circumspectly. Look well before you leap." And in the spirit of caution thus inculcated, men go on looking so that they never leap—go on looking, till looking becomes irresolution, and irresolution cowardice, and cowardice passes into apathy, and apathy becomes tinged with cynicism. And in the end they are found to have avoided the perils of enthusiasm and precipitancy only to contemplate a fruitless life. There is, at least, as much danger of not doing right as there is of doing wrong. Perhaps if precipitancy slays its thousands, irresolution slays its ten thousands.

But this sort of emphasis on mere caution is a gross misreading of St. Paul's advice. "Look accurately," he says, "how ye walk; not as unwise, but as wise"—that is, you are not meant to live at random, or from hand to mouth; life is intended to be a deliberate and continuous proceeding, controlled by reasonable motives. It presents a succession of occasions, of opportunities, made all the more impressive by the vast amount of moral evil and corruption which surrounds us in all directions. You must be always on the alert to secure these opportunities in the interests of your faith, "buying up the opportunity because the days are evil" There are two main facts, you see, in St. Paul's mind—the "evil" of the "days" the reality of the "opportunity." These afford the conditions for Christian thoughtfulness. And it becomes plain how far removed in St. Paul's mind this thoughtfulness is to be from mere negative prudence as he proceeds to develop its characteristics: they are three. First, there is to be a positive apprehension of the Divine will in particular cases, such as qualifies for decisive action. "Be not foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is." Secondly, there is to be a strong and sociable enthusiasm, expressing itself in uninterrupted joy, and based upon deep draughts of the Divine Spirit. Men of pleasure, in St. Paul's day as in our own, would seek escape from the dulness of life and its sense of isolation in the excitement and fellowship which comes of intoxicating drink; the Christians are to find as strong an excitement and as warm a fellowship in deep draughts of the wine of the Holy Ghost. "Be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit, speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord, giving thanks always for all things, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to God even the Father." Lastly, there is to be a spirit of mutual submission, accommodation, order. "Subjecting yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ." It was said of old of the men of Issachar, who gathered round the standard of David, that they "had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do. The heads of them were two hundred, and all their brethren were at their commandment." * A similar spirit of practical religious understanding, with a similar readiness to obey their leaders, is what St. Paul desires in the new Israel, to do the work of the true Son of David. Now this temper of clear, positive understanding as to what God wills to be done in the immediate future, fired by an ardent and sociable religious enthusiasm, and associated with a disinterested readiness to obey in practical affairs—this temper, I say, which is what St. Paul means by a careful Christian "walk" in evil days, is the very opposite of a timorous and negative prudence. Rather it is the spirit of the ideal soldier, the spirit of the "happy warrior."

What the "evil" of St. Paul's "days" was we know from this very Epistle to the Ephesians. He describes what he had seen and experienced of contemporary Asiatic life. Viewed socially—its sensuality in talk and conduct, its mendacity, its avarice, its malice; viewed spiritually—its pervading sense of hopelessness, loneliness, mutual distrust, isolation from God and the truest human fellowship. And we know from this same Epistle how he thought of the opportunity, "the great door and effectual opened" for Christians. He has a glorious vision of a holy, brotherly, truthful, pure human society—the Church, which he sees fulfilled with the Divine life, and welcoming into its warm and comfortable citizenship the isolated, weary, sin-stained, hopeless, godless of the world. Already in his statesmanlike mind he saw how the lines of the Roman Empire could be made avail-

* 1 Chron. xii. 32. γινώσκοντες σύνεσιν εἰς τοὺς καιρούς, γινώσκοντες τί ποιῆσαι Ἰσραήλ.

able for the organisation and intercommunion of this new spiritual kingdom. Yes, we know what St. Paul meant by the evil days and by the opportunity; we know with what marvellous success, even amidst overwhelming difficulties, he "bought up" this opportunity. But what do these phrases mean for us to-day? They mean what is both the same as what they meant for St. Paul and different; the same in principle, different in conditions. Let us consider what they mean. For certainly now again the "days are evil" and the "opportunity" is manifest and incalculably great.

II.—"The days are evil." Good men always feel them so. Certainly the "good old times" recede on inquiry beyond the limits of recorded history. Nor is it a very possible task to balance the evils of one age against those of another. It is enough for us to try and understand "the ills we have." There is to-day, among ourselves in England, at least some real ground for serious alarm in view of the moral prospect. Our days are evil. And if one try to characterise the evil it may be found in nothing more centrally than in the lack of a positive, decisive sense of the Divine righteousness, and the severe claim which it makes on human life. "Oh, ye that love the Lord," cries the Psalmist, "see that ye hate the thing which is evil." We find it difficult to do this, even the best of us. We have learnt to be considerate towards sin and error; to take account of their circumstances, of ignorance, temptation, heredity. And we take account of these things so far that there is hardly anything we can decisively condemn, except perhaps direct physical cruelty and intolerance. Contemporary literature —"impressionist," if we may call it so—reflects the common spirit. Everythiug is regarded as having a claim on our sympathy, that represents any real phase of feeling, any real passion, any real aspect of things, no matter how it fits into the whole of life, or how it squares with fixed standards of right and wrong. It is enough to be interesting. So in practical life the spirit of severity and sternness is rare – very rare the clear, strong intolerance of evil. We feel this in Oxford. That it is hard to enforce discipline, rare to find simple, willing, conscientious obedience, is a result of a widespread temper, in which clear, moral judgments, distinct ideas of duty, wholesome severity with oneself first, and then with others, are at a discount. There is a vast deal of mere moral slackness, of which one evidence is the tone of easy-going toleration, even among those who are themselves well conducted, in regard to occasional drunkenness—a toleration or acquiescence which sometimes appals one. Now, this moral slackness of tone, prevailing as it does among the upper classes, would alarm the watchful Christian less if it belonged only to the upper classes. If an indignant and righteous people lay behind a laxer upper class, one could look forward with unimpaired satisfaction to the triumph of democracy and righteousness. But stalwart righteousness, unflinching conscientiousness, stern morality, is not a commoner plant, apparently, in one social region than in another. Have you read the serious words of a man who always seems to watch the artisan class with equal opportunity of observation and power of insight? The Warden of Toynbee Hall writes thus in his "Twenty Years' Retrospect" * :—

> There is much in a retrospect of twenty years to rouse satisfaction, and much to rouse disappointment.
>
> On the whole it may be said that the standard of comfort in the East End has risen. The people are better housed, better fed, and better clad; they take more pleasure, and take it in more wholesome ways; there is less rowdyism in the streets, and there is now some interest in public affairs. . . . [On the other hand] it may be said that there has been a decrease of old-fashioned honesty, an increase of impertinence and of the habit of gambling. Under the influence of teaching, some good and some bad, stealing and lying no longer rank among the chief vices. Men and women who would not commit a vulgar theft, or pick a pocket, think it little evil to cheat the railway or tram-car company, to claim as property chance findings, or to "best" a tradesman or employer. There is much talk about what is right in little matters, but the "robust conscience" which damns as wrong any departure from simple honesty and truth is often wanting. Mothers are no longer so stern about truth-speaking in their children, they often pass over lies as of little consequence, and in the schools the accepted assumption is that an excuse is an untruth. A workman's word can hardly be counted as his bond, and a promise even to join a party is not one on which to place dependence.
>
> It is this want of honesty which makes suspicion so common in many working-class organisations, and makes it hard for leaders to lead. . . . Old-fashioned puritanical morality has, in fact, been replaced by the sentiment which makes suffering the one evil, and counts that action good which, even by lying and thieving, reduces suffering. The Puritan, with his "Nonconformist conscience," who long survived among working people, is not now so common.
>
> In the same way there seems to be an increase of what, for want of a better word, may be called "impertinence," or of that sort of independence which refuses to confess any ignorance, or allow any superiority, which never goes softly or hesitates to rush in where angels fear to tread. There is, of course, a good side to this independence as there is to every kind of independence. It means that people are no longer servile or unconscious of strength. But such "impertinence" is very ugly. . . . There are many signs of this self-trust – children choose their own schools; boys and girls take their lives in their hands, and leave their homes to live in lodgings; the greatest admiration is professed in the clubs for "smartness," and the acknowledgment that any reverence is due to man – even to God – is growing rare. Obedience is not counted among the virtues, because there seems to be no one greater than self.
>
> But, perhaps, even more noticeable than decrease of honesty and increase of impertinence is the growth of the habit of gambling. Of this there is no question. The result of a race is of more general interest than a vote in Parliament. . . .

The writer goes on to show how such distressing symptoms may be only transitional. They may be evils attendant upon real progress :—

> But for those who live at the moment when dishonesty, impertinence, and gambling are so evident, it is not sufficient that they sit down with vague hopes of better times. If,

* *Practicable Socialism*, page 3.

therefore, as a conclusion of a retrospect of twenty years, it be allowed that these signs exist, while the level of comfort has risen, and the level of life remains stationary, the question to be answered is—What is still to be done?

I will not comment upon this summary of an observant man's experience. But I say that, among all encouraging features of our life—and encouraging features are real and many—the prevalence of a spirit of lawlessness, a spirit, I mean, not of revolt against a particular law, but of general moral slackness, pervading all classes and showing itself alike in rich and poor, in politics, in commerce, in marriage, in literature, in industry, in common life, is a most alarming fact. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, and sin is a reproach to any people." Nay, if the Prophets of the Old Testament spoke eternal truth, it tends to bring inevitable catastrophe on any people.

We sometimes hear this or that Old Testament Prophet described as a "Radical agitator." All that it seems to me we can truthfully say is that a Radical agitator might well be like an Old Testament Prophet. The Prophet has a burning hatred of selfishness, and luxury, and injustice in society, and of cruelty towards the poor, a holy contempt for easy-going religion, an unflinching determination to speak his stern words in "the king's sanctuary and the royal house." But his point of view is not the rights of a class, but the will of a holy God. And the point of view makes a vast difference. It is this vivid sense of the will of a righteous God, bearing equally upon all classes and sorts of men, which we do so terribly need, as in politics, so in society as a whole. This will of a righteous God is impartial. It is against unrighteousness of all sorts. It knows clear distinctions. It cannot tolerate false shows. It is the spirit of judgment. It calls good good and evil evil. It discerns between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not. As for those who anticipate social reformation by mere political and educational progress without widespread moral penitence and conversion, the prophet would say to them, "Wherefore would ye have the day of the Lord? It is darkness and not light. Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness and not light, even very dark and no brightness in it?"

"The days are evil," I say: therefore "buy up the opportunity." The opportunity lies specially with the faithful Christians, who know what to rely upon. Since Isaiah taught the doctrine of the remnant, good men have always known where to turn for reassurance amidst even widespread corruption. They look away from the aspect of things "on the average" to search for the faithful servants of God. Where these are, there is the secret of recovery, the hope of revival. Now in one's most despondent moments to-day one can never doubt the reality among us of true Christian discipleship, and that in all classes. The faithful are everywhere. The men who believe wholly in God—the Father, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit; and who know what His claim means and utterly respond to it and exult in the Divine will. Such men and women so certainly exist everywhere—if not in large numbers anywhere—that if the impossible were to happen and a persecution of Christianity by fire and sword sweep over England to-day, one is never tempted to doubt that the spirit of martyrdom would be found among us. With these faithful, then, or with those who would be faithful, lies the "opportunity" in each generation. And the opportunity, I cannot but think, at the present day, is special and admits of being characterised both intellectually and morally.

III.—Intellectually, it is the removal of obstacles. I think it is right to characterise the intellectual movement of the last twenty years as, in one aspect, a removal of obstacles to religious belief. (*a*) It is an old story now that when present scientific conceptions of the method of natural evolution in general and of the origin of mankind in particular first became prevalent, they were met with a chorus of theological denunciation. Darwin had some reason to deprecate being handed over to the "black beasts"—meaning, I am afraid, us clergy. But it is quite certain that this scientific obstacle has been, in the main, removed. In part it has been through the theologians abandoning false claims, and learning, if somewhat unwillingly, that they have no "Bible revelation" in matters of science; in part it has been through its becoming continually more apparent that the limits of scientific "explanation" of nature are soon reached; that the ultimate causes, forces, conditions of nature are as unexplained as ever, or rather postulate as ever for their explanation a Divine mind. Thus if one "argument from design" was destroyed, another was only brought into prominence. No account which science can give, by discovery or conjecture, of the method of creation, can ever weaken the argument which lies from the universality of law, order, and beauty in the universe to the universality of mind. The mind of man looks forth into nature, and finds nowhere unintelligible chance, but everywhere an order, a system, a law, a beauty, which corresponds, as greater to less, to his own rational and spiritual intuitions, methods, and expectations. Universal order, intelligibility, beauty, mean that something akin to the human spirit, something of which the human spirit is an offshoot and a reflection, is in the universe before it is in man.

Or again, a prolonged period of controversy and reflection has resulted in making it fairly apparent that no scientific doctrine or conjecture about the dim origins of the spiritual life of man can affect the argument from its development and persistence. It has developed and persisted, as one of the most promi-

nent features of human life, solely on the postulate of God. And is it not out of analogy with all that science teaches us to imagine that so important, continuous, and universal a development of human faculty could have arisen and persisted unless it were in correspondence with reality?

In fact, we may almost say that the obstacles to belief on the side of science were gone when once it was admitted that God, Who has revealed to us His nature and ours, and made this revelation in part through an historical process and the literature of a nation, has yet, and for obvious reasons, given us no revelation at all on matters which fall within the domain of scientific research.

(*b*) A similar removal of obstacles must be claimed in the region of historical criticism. There, again, it has become apparent that, whatever turns out true about this or that Old Testament narrative, no question really vital to the Christian religion can be said to be at stake in this field, while in the region of the New Testament the most sifting criticism has had a result emphatically reassuring. The critical evidence justifies, or more than justifies, the belief of the Church which is expressed in her creeds. We have read, or shall be reading in this place, Dr. Hort's just published lectures on "Judaistic Christianity." If any book can be significant just because it contains nothing surprising, this is the book. No man was ever more thoroughly a critic than Hort. No man was ever freer in his pursuit of the truth. No man was less careful of the consequences where the truth led. No man his superior, scarcely any his rival, in fulness and accuracy of knowledge in all matters bearing on New Testament criticism. Yet, in the end, when he presents us with his conclusions—the conclusions of forty years of the best sort of work—they are soberly, quietly conservative. Everything is firmly, justly laid down; almost nothing is surprising. It is a good book, because it is so quiet.

I say, then, the last twenty years have seen the removal of intellectual obstacles to belief on the side of science and on the side of criticism. A personal example gives vividness to a general conclusion, and this general conclusion is very vivid to my mind at the present moment, through a manuscript from the hand of one whom Oxford had recently to deplore, which for the last two months has been constantly in my hand. George Romanes was well known here as a leading biologist, as well as much beside, for he was a man of many interests, and in character one who claimed and made and kept many close friends. But it was not generally known that his mind had become increasingly occupied in religious problems, and that in the last ten years he was passing very slowly from a position of rigid agnosticism, almost of materialism, into the full communion of the Church, in which, at last, with intellectual faculties unimpaired, he peacefully died. The record of his religious thought, the record of his change of mind, he has left in notes for a book—fragmentary, alas! but still wholly intelligible—which will soon, I hope, see the light. But I am justified now in summarising their contents. George Romanes saw how real had been the removal of obstacles to belief on both the counts which I have already described during the last twenty years. He saw how much science leaves unaccounted for; how large the room it leaves, at least, for belief in God; how compatible with Theism are the conclusions of his friend and teacher, Darwin. When he first felt this, ten years ago, he felt also almost overwhelmingly the evidence antagonistic to belief in the goodness of God which arises from the cruelty of nature. Gradually, however, this objection weakened; partly through the perception of the end towards which nature moves—the physical evil being the inevitable accompaniment of the process; partly through the growing sense of the positive evidence for the revelation of Divine love in Christ. Human nature became more prominent to his mind; physical nature was no longer all in all; and human nature, as he looked at it, appeared ever more certainly and securely to postulate God, to be unaccountable without God. Then, again, if there be a God, and He will to reveal Himself, it seemed to him increasingly plain that the revelation would be to the whole man, not to the scientific reason alone, but pre-eminently through moral and spiritual processes. All the deficiencies in the merely scientific demonstration of God's existence seemed now to fall in with the doctrine of moral and spiritual probation and the legitimate demand upon man for the exercise of faith. Then the strength of the positive evidences for Christianity impressed themselves upon him—in part the historical, still more the spiritual. The phenomenon of the Christian consciousness came to bear an unmistakable witness; and behind that, its source and explanation, stood the figure of Christ, as something which natural evolution was quite unable to account for. Thus slowly Romanes was brought near to belief; slowly the obstacles to belief, one after another, fell away; slowly, quite at the last, the actual activity and habit of faith in God dawned again in his life. That "pure" one "in heart" in a measure, even before his death, "saw God." And for us his religious thoughts bear witness, on the one side to the removal of obstacles of which I have been speaking, on the other side to the fact that no removal of scientific or historical obstacles can ever do anything more than afford room and scope and opportunity for positive faith. With us, then, to-day, the removal of obstacles both leaves an opportunity and makes a claim for a more energetic faith up to the limit of our light.

IV.—But our opportunity is hardly less marked in the moral world. It lies in the absence of any strong moral competitor with Christianity. There are classes still, no doubt, who are inclined to hope too much for the bettering of human life from legislative changes. That the classes who have hitherto

been less prominently and personally represented in Parliament should be liable to this mistake is natural. Experience will teach them that legislation can abolish hindrances, but that the far more important factor in social progress is personal character. But to the upper and middle classes, who have already been more directly and for a long time influential in legislation, this, speaking generally, may be said to be already plain. It is obvious to us that our immediate predecessors hoped too much from Free Trade, a broad suffrage, and universal education in secular knowledge. Thus there is at present a marked absence of any positive enthusiasm which is a rival to Christianity as a basis for life. Literature, philosophy, politics, are alike lacking in strong moral impulse. On all sides men —believers, unbelievers, doubters—are looking towards Christianity and the Church, and saying, "What can you do to help human life? What is your Gospel? Will it work?" Now, as of old, we may say, "All men seek" Jesus Christ. It is then, in our time, increasingly plain that there really is no basis for the moral, the domestic, the personal life of man, except in belief in God, the Father of Jesus Christ. This lack of rival enthusiasms constitutes our moral opportunity. Christianity has a direct application to all the needs of life. It is not an abstract philosophy or dogma; it is a life, a social life, based on a common belief in God who has revealed Himself. Let the Church show the application of her religion to life; let her make it felt in general and detail; the field is open for her without a considerable rival to appeal to "every man's conscience." We have had occasion enough, again and again, to see the mistake, let us rather say the sin, of perverting the religion of Jesus into an easy-going religion for the well off. Now we have our chance of letting men know that the ideas which are stirring in democracy, the ideas which constitute its Divine justification, are the very same ideas which lie at the heart of the Christian religion. That with God is no respect of persons; that all men should, as far as possible, have an equal opportunity of making the best of themselves; that wealth is a trust rather than a right; that we are our brother's keepers; that a man who will not work should not eat—these are democratic cries and they are also Christian principles. The Church again, according to its original constitution, was the embodiment of that ideal of properly representative Government under equal Divine law, which is astir in the popular movement. What have we to do but to make these facts known and felt?

The "opportunity" is great. The removal of intellectual obstacles to belief leaves the Church specially free to assert the authority of her Faith—her central faith, as it is expressed in her creed and presupposed in her worship; and if she can learn from the experience of the past, she will be careful to avoid renewing again that elaboration of dogma which in mediæval scholasticism aroused the bitter resentment, almost the loathing, of men as good as Colet and as great as Erasmus. A strong, central creed; a cordial, beautiful, and intelligible worship; a continual application of religious truth to common life—these are the instruments, the noble instruments, by which the Church may take advantage of the opportunity for glorious advance.

V.—"The days are evil," the "opportunity" is great. It can be taken by the Church as a whole only if it is realised and taken by the individuals who compose the Church; by us whose responsibilities in this place are so great; by you, most of all, who have yet the joy of being young, the eye for "seeing visions," and the heart and strength to live by them.

Listen then to St. Paul's admonishing—that Apostle of fiery enthusiasm, of statesmanlike enterprise, of strenuous action. His, I have said, is a threefold counsel. First: "Be not foolish, but understanding, what the will of the Lord is." This practical understanding, as St. Paul tells the Romans, is the result of courageous confession and self-surrender. Cast away that sort of "hypocrisy reversed," which leads men to seem less believing, less careful about the things of religion than in fact in their real selves they are. Show your gratitude for obstacles to belief removed by a more vigorous confession of the name of Christ up to the point to which your conscience will allow you to go. Throw yourself upon the truth you see or feel. And the generosity of this, your self-committal, will be rewarded by a larger measure of moral clearness "to discern things that are excellent," "to prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" for yourselves. Most happy are you, in my judgment, if that increased clearness of moral view determines you for the ministry of the priesthood. Never, I believe, at least since the end of the seventeenth century, had the clergy of England as good a chance as they have now. But if the ministry be not your vocation, at least let it be so that the career you adopt is adopted with a sense of the Divine approval, with a clear conviction that a Christian life means a life devoted to realising with increasing clearness and to following the will of a righteous God.

Secondly, "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit." Have you resolved to avoid, aye, I trust, and to utterly discountenance, gross sins? Then see to it, that you do not sink into that darkness, that monotony, that loneliness from which drunkenness itself is sought as an escape. Seek more diligently the face of God: drink in humbler faith, more largely and freely, the draughts of the Holy Spirit. Take more pains about your prayers, your Communions. Not least, devote some time each week "to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" the spiritual nourishment of Holy Scripture—of that especially

in Holy Scripture which appeals plainly to your conscience and life. This application to worship and the Scriptures will be rewarded by what nothing else can give—the joy of the Spirit, the temper of thankfulness, and that freedom and reality of religious belief which enables you to make friends in your faith, as "they that feared the Lord" of old "spake often one to another."

Lastly, "submit yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ." Cultivate the habit of obedience, reasonable obedience but real. Englishmen are terribly apt to become so independent that corporate action becomes very difficult. We must be always prepared to stand alone and stiff where a real matter of conscience is concerned; but we want to cultivate the habit of mutual concession in details and the power to merge minor differences so as to work with others and follow a clear leading where it is shown.

Clear insight into the will of God, general and particular; a strong and sociable enthusiasm of faith; a capacity for corporate action—these are the needs of the Christian warrior and the opportunity is his.

He it is—

> Whose high endeavours are an inward light
> That makes the path before him always bright.
> . . . . . .
> Whose power shed round him in the common strife
> Or mild concerns of ordinary life
> A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
> But who if he be called upon to face
> Some awful moment to which heaven has joined
> Great issues good or bad for human kind,
> Is happy as a Lover; and attir'd
> With sudden brightness, like a man inspired:
> And through the heat of conflict keeps the law
> In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw.

CANON ELLISON was on Saturday, the 22nd ult., installed as Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral at the afternoon service. It is a happy and very fitting thing (says the *Canterbury Diocesan Gazette*) that the founder of the Church of England Temperance Society should become attached, after two other Honorary Canonries—Lichfield and Christ Church, Oxford—to the Metropolitical Cathedral at last.

THE *Lancashire Evening Express* says that Bishop Cramer-Roberts, vicar of Blackburn, has offered the living of Langho, vacant by the death of the Rev. M. Heatley, to the Rev. F. G. Chevassût, curate of Holy Trinity, Blackburn, and he has accepted the appointment. There are two churches in the parish. Mr. Chevassût is M.A. of Trinity College, Dublin, and was ordained in 1887. "He has done good work in Holy Trinity parish, and the appointment will be an exceedingly popular one. He is a good Churchman, of moderate views, and of kindly and conciliatory manners, and does not sympathise with either of the extreme schools of thought in the Church. Mr. Chevassût is also a Freemason, and his brethren in the many lodges in the north-east Lancashire district will be highly gratified at the Episcopal recognition of his services and worth."

PAUL'S PRAYER FOR THE ROMANS.

BY THE REV. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.

SERMON PREACHED AT BRIGSTOCK, DECEMBER 9TH, 1894.

"Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost."—ROMANS xv. 13.

THE prayer of our text indicates that he who uttered it had a large heart. It shows, indeed, the real character of the Apostle. It connects him with the great Deity. It shows his sympathy for man. It is the prayer of a real Christian, no other man could conceive it. All this lies on the surface. Such a wish must have originated from within. Where nothing is, thence nothing can come. The prayer is in its nature Divine. It could, therefore, only come from one who had been taught of God. It shows that the love of God had been shed abroad in his heart, that he knew its power, and that it alone could bring happiness.

Where the love of God is, there is also love for men. "The love of Christ constraineth us. . . ." No man can say in any sense, "I love God," if he hate his brother. The Apostle did not, and could not, say anything of the kind. He loved God, and he loved his fellow-man, too. This prayer was no vague, meaningless expression in his mouth. The best test of the sincerity of a man's words is his conduct. "By their fruits ye shall know them." The Apostle's words will bear this test. No man laboured more than he to make known the Gospel. He "was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the Apostles." He was a man of noble parts, and could have won his way to the highest pinnacle of fame by his intellectual powers, yet he counted all but dung that he might win Christ and work for Him. "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel."

This prayer means more than we can tell. "The God of hope fill you with all joy and peace!" The appeal is to one who is able to gratify the wish. It can go no higher, for it is to God. "He is able to do whatever He will." The Apostle gives a warrant, a reason, a hope, that the prayer will be answered. And what is this? "God of hope." What does this imply? We are reminded of the meaning by this day's services, the second Sunday's in Advent, in whose Collect we pray, "Grant that we may in such wise hear them, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them, that by patience and comfort of Thy Holy Word we may embrace and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life. . . ." God is He in Whom there is hope of everlasting life.

The Apostle is writing to the Gentiles, and "salvation is of the Jews." To them God first revealed His will. Of them Christ came. But it

is not confined to them, for "the middle wall of partition is broken down," and "He has made both one." "There is no difference." The Apostle has been appealing to the Old Testament in proof of these things. And now he prays the prayer of the text. It is as if he had said, "The God who has given His word for it, that the Saviour who came first to the Jews, should also be a 'light to lighten the Gentiles. . .' This God, who hath made you to hope by His word—and His word cannot change—may He fill you with all joy and peace!" God's word is His warrant. He could not have and could not wish any more potent.

The prayer is for priceless blessings. He prays that they may be filled "with all joy." Now this is a thing better known in the realisation than in the ideal. We know its nature and worth better when we possess it than we can imagine it from any description. There are many things in the world that do not admit of being described. Language does not suffice. If we would know them, we must taste, feel, see, touch. It is so here. The joy of the Christian may only be felt, it cannot be described. Joy is that thing which we experience when some unexpected and undeserved blessing, favour, grace, mercy comes to us. There are two kinds. There is temporal joy. This comes to us when we have had a little unexpected success in any business or enterprise. This is not lasting. Like most other things of the earth, it soon passes away, and often leaves behind a great void. The joy of the text is heavenly. It accompanies heavenly blessings as pardon and answers to prayer. It is more lasting, though it is not always alike, but is subject to fluctuations. It is not, however, in its nature evanescent, but lasting.

But this is only half the Apostle's wish. Heaven's blessings come not singly, but in troops. God is rich in blessing, and gives more than one at a time. The Apostle prays for peace—"all joy and peace." Peace is the soul at rest. There are two things, which to the mind that thinks, are calculated to give unrest—the remembrance of past sins, and looking forward to the reckoning day. These things disturb the mind. The thoughts, like the troubled waves of the sea, tumble and toss and foam. All is unrest and commotion within Peace is the opposite of all this. It is the clear, bright tranquillity of the soul reflecting the pureness of God's image. It would require the pen of a sage to describe, the tongue of an angel to tell what it is. The Apostle in another place calls it "the peace which passeth all understanding."

The Apostle prayed for these two priceless things for the Romans, and he does not deal with half measures. He does not pray that some may be imparted, but He asks that they might be filled. Had he good grounds? Yes, the best. God gives with no niggardly hand. We forget that God is good, and that love is His best name. "He giveth liberally and upbraideth not." We forget that He has said, "Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it."

But now, and this is a point to mark, the Apostle does not ask for these things absolutely, unconditionally. Such a course would be unreasonable. There is a condition implied. This condition is a disposition to receive the things prayed for. He adds, therefore, "in believing." "With the heart man believeth." The heart must be prepared by faith for receiving God's blessing. What is this faith?

The question is more easily asked than answered. Faith is rightly described as the principle of the spiritual life. It is absolutely necessary to its existence and well-being. Here is the point on which so many people go wrong. It involves mystery. Men reject Christianity for this reason. It were as wise to assert that we are not, because no man has ever yet been able to explain what life is. We can no more understand what the principle of natural life is than we can understand what the principle of spiritual life is. If any man think he knows, let him explain what life in any sense is. What is it? Well, we know a living person from a dead body; aye, but our knowledge ends there. We cannot explain what is that thing, life, which makes the difference. We may go further and distinguish a living soul from a dead one. But what is life here? We may only say that faith is the principle of the soul's life.

But do we know that this is true? Yes, here is the proof, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," "He that believeth shall be saved." "All things are possible to them that believe." "If ye shall ask anything in My name, believing, ye shall receive." And there is more in the Scriptures to the same purport.

The reasonableness of this is easy to see. Faith is possible to all. Everyone can believe. If any other thing were made the condition of life, then God would not be just. Suppose, for instance, that power were the condition of life, then kings and great men only could be saved. If riches, then only the rich; if poverty, then only the poor; if learning, then only the learned; if ignorance, then only the unlearned could be saved. It is only as it is that salvation is possible to all, and that "God can be just and yet the Justifier of them that believe in Jesus." "He hath included all under sin that He might have mercy upon all." So the invitation is full and free. "Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth." "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

We know, too, that faith must be exercised in a sphere in which there is room to doubt. It must be so, or it could not be the principle of life. If

a man could not do otherwise than believe, there would be nothing on which faith could feed. "Faith," says the Apostle, "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

We do not see God save only as we see Him manifested in His works. These display His power, wisdom, and goodness, but they do not speak of His love to lost sinners. They tell us nothing of His mercy and compassion in providing such a mighty salvation for us in the person of His dear Son. We know these things only as the Bible reveals them. And it is here that faith is in its true province. Faith takes these truths and assimilates them. Faith is the digestive organ in man's soul. Faith takes of the bountiful supplies of spiritual food which God has provided and passes it into the fibre of the soul. Hence the prayer already noticed in the Collect for to-day, the second Sunday in Advent. Whatever God says, promises, threatens, directs, commands, foretells, gives, faith lays hold upon. Faith is, indeed, the disposing power, the preparing power, the receiving power, in our hearts, for God's blessing, "Be it unto thee according to thy faith." And it is to minds, spirits so prepared, that the Apostle prays for the blessings of our text.

The result which follows on receiving the blessings of the Apostle's prayer is clearly explained in the text, abounding in hope, "that ye may abound in hope." We will not dwell upon this. What it is may be gathered from the special teaching of this Advent season. The man who abounds in hope can look forward with confidence to that great day when Christ shall come again to fetch His loved ones home. He says, as he thinks of it, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that at the last day He shall stand upon the earth," and adds, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

We have come nearly to the end of the text. It closes, "through the power of the Holy Ghost." We must always remember the truth embodied in these words. It is most important, though too often forgotten. "The Holy Ghost is the Author and Giver of life." At the first, "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the deep," then light appeared and things began to take shape. The conditions of light and order are the same in the soul. The Spirit must move on the darkness and chaos of the soul.

We can only watch and pray; we cannot create the light or bring about the moral κοσμος. "Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God must give the increase." Oh! that the Holy Spirit of God would work amongst us! Here is the reason of our want of spiritual life—we do not pray for the outpouring of God's spirit. When we pray, it is with our lips. When we sing our hearts are silent. When we read the Scriptures, we forget the prayer always requisite, "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold the wondrous things written in Thy law." When we listen to the preached Word it is to have our fancies tickled. And when we come to the Lord's Table, we do it too formally. This is the source of our weakness "we call not upon God."

Let me, then, in conclusion, press home these facts. (1.) There is a tremendous power in the Gospel. It can fill you with joy and peace in believing. That is it for which it was designed. (2.) This is the truth which the Bible everywhere teaches. This day, the second Sunday in Advent, commemorates this truth. The special object which the Church had in mind respecting this day was that of enforcing and emphasising this truth. It must stand, for God has said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My word shall not pass away." (3.) It becomes us, as we value our souls, to pray that we may all be taught by the Holy Spirit to know this truth. Here is our warrant, as it is our encouragement, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him."

And may we think on these facts till by the Spirit's power we come into such a spiritual state that we may take up the Apostle's words and use them to ourselves and for each other, "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost."

It was announced a few days ago that Archdeacon Gaul has accepted the bishopric of Mashonaland. The Ven. W. T. Gaul was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, taking his degree in 1872. In the following year he was ordained by the Bishop of Derry, and soon afterwards took up missionary work in South Africa. From 1875 to 1880 he was precentor of Bloemfontein Cathedral, and 1884 rector of All Saints', Dutoitspan. He became a canon of Bloemfontein in 1881, and Archdeacon of Kimberley in 1887.

THE following official notification is issued from the Privy Council Office:—"A new post has been created under the Education Department for the purpose of obtaining special information and issuing special reports from time to time in relation to educational work at home and abroad. The frequent demand for fuller information on many educational subjects and the great increase of purely administrative work, both at the Education Department in Whitehall and at the Science and Art Department, have made it desirable to have a separate officer in charge of a small additional branch for the above-named purpose, who will be designated 'Director of Special Inquiries and Reports.' This appointment has been accepted by Mr. M. E. Sadler, Student of Christ Church, and Secretary of the University Extension Delegacy at Oxford." Mr. Michael Ernest Sadler was a Scholar of Trinity College, and obtained a First Class in Classical Moderations in 1882, and a First Class in the Final Classical School in 1884. In 1890 he was elected a Student of Christ Church, and was subsequently appointed to the office of Steward of that Society.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 12, 1895.

ANGELS AND MINISTERS OF GRACE.

IN artistic circles a queer question has lately arisen as to the correct delineation of angels. The conventional robed and winged figures are criticised as "weak." We admit it. Dignity and strength are not even remotely expressed by the queer creatures we see at this season upon Christmas cards and in coloured prints; and their counterparts in sacred pictures are no more impressive. We always wonder how they got their clothes over their wings, and if the plumage was damaged in the process.

Michael Angelo and, afterwards, William Blake took the bold course of depicting angels in undraped strength and beauty. That got over the difficulty of the clothes, but it raised the greater difficulty of the want of them. After all, even angels must respect *les convenances*. Perhaps the old scandal of pre-patriarchal days has not been forgotten yet. Certain it is that the artist who, nowadays, ventured to depict angelic proportions in anything short of full skirts would shortly find it necessary to turn his attention to less important, and presumably less demoralising, models. Rembrandt tried another way. He avoided scandal by painting the angels in "Jacob's Dream" as beautiful, but indistinct, forms gliding down moonbeams. But this too delicate reticence is open to objection. To the classical student the picture suggests Iris and the rainbow, the plain man thinks of "A Midsummer Night's Dream." Such comparisons are odious. Imagine Puck and Oberon trying to pass themselves off as Jacob's angels, and intruding into a patriarch's dreams!

But there is another alternative. We must stick to the form and, for decency's sake, we must keep to the drapery. But need we keep to the wings? It is their absurd misappropriateness that causes all the trouble. Anatomically they are without justification, historically they are without precedent. The Greeks never made their divine visitants depend upon unworkable wings. When they wished to introduce wings symbolically they attached them to the shoes and hat, so that their purport could not be mistaken.

The ancient races of the East, including the Hebrews, did much the same. The winged bulls and lions, the Cherubim and Seraphim, were never made like natural creatures; other abnormal features were usually associated with the wings, which were depicted in conventional positions, so that the symbolism could not be mistaken. The angels of Ezekiel, with two, three, and more pairs of wings, and other allegorical attributes, bore no resemblance to the effigy on the Christmas card. In fact, the modern angel may be said to have no artistic precedent, either Christian or Pagan. He is neither symbolical nor natural, he is a mere monstrosity. We cannot take him seriously. How much the poor position held in our system by angelology has to do with our false and inartistic representation of angel forms cannot be guessed. It is perhaps true to say that not one grown-up person in twenty gives any serious consideration to angel ministrations. We treat them as we treat the angels in pictures, conventionally, providing material for Sunday fairy tales and juvenile books of devotion. But at present we attach no serious importance to the "strong angel" of St. John, and the verse of St. Matthew: "In Heaven their angels do always behold the face of the Father." Probably, so long as this is our attitude towards the angels themselves, the fashion of their counterfeit presentment will do well enough. We do not feel the need of assigning any beauty or dignity to forms which in reality represent nothing. Therefore we remain contented with the voluminous skirts and the property wings. Some day, perhaps, an artist will arise with a better conception of angelic powers and purposes, and he will give us a better picture.

LIES!

NO words can be found too strong to condemn the action of the Press in reporting the recent disastrous fire in the Edgware Road. Perhaps people cannot always keep their heads when eight persons are being burnt alive before their eyes. And yet it is not too much to expect that a little care should be taken before scattering broadcast serious charges against such a hard-working and noble body of men as the London Fire Brigade. In the accounts of this fire it was

widely stated that serious delay occurred before the arrival of the engines and of the fire-escape, and that the water supply was inefficient. Statements like these amount to serious charges when the building concerned was burning like matchwood, and every minute was of importance. The sensation aroused was great, and that of course was the point aimed at. But it is hard indeed that newspaper men, who perhaps never did anything heroic in their lives, should achieve their sensations at the expense of men who spend, and often lose, their lives in encountering peril and hardship in the public service.

An inquest was duly held on the victims, and the jury, upon which sat a man who had been misled into supporting the statements of the Press, stated in their verdict that all efforts were made to subdue the fire; that there was no delay on the part of the fire brigade, and that the water supply was ample for the engines. To a certain extent that puts all right. But the evil is this, that for one person who reads the verdict a hundred read the sensational reports, and thus is the reptile Press justified of its children.

CHURCH NOTES.

NEW YEAR'S EVE was a particularly miserable night, and no doubt this had the effect of diminishing the attendance at the midnight services, which are now nearly universal in London, especially in the West-end. According to the *Record*, the churches in the poorer districts were crowded. At St. James's, Bermondsey, said to be the largest church in South London, there was an immense congregation. It was clear that many of the congregation were altogether unaccustomed to a place of worship; indeed, the vicar, the Rev. E. N. Coulthard, in his address, plainly assumed that there were scores of people present who had not been to church since the similar service of the previous year. His subject was "The Midnight Service" in the gaol at Philippi, and he spoke very impressively from the words, "What must I do to be saved?"

The Rev. R. B. Ransford, vicar of St. Jude's, East Brixton, who was chaplain to Sir George Tyler during his year of office as Lord Mayor, has accepted the living of St. Paul's, Upper Norwood Mr. Ransford, who has held his present charge since 1869, is universally esteemed in South London as an able and hard-working parish clergyman.

It is now known, the *Record* says, that the Bishop of Worcester, in nominating two clergy for the suffragan see of Coventry, placed second the name of the Rev. Henry Sutton, of Bordesley, so long and so honourably associated with the home secretaryship of the C.M.S. Canon Stevens, of Stratford, was, according to the same authority, the "second string" for Colchester.

The Dean of Lichfield and his coadjutors have not succeeded in drawing from their Bishop any expression of opinion upon the consecration of Señor Cabrera. Dr. Legge states in his reply that some of the questions raised in the Dean's memorial will probably be submitted to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion collectively, and that it would therefore be improper for an individual Bishop to prejudge them. He fails to see, however, how the Church of England can be held responsible for the action of an Archbishop and Bishops of a National Church which is beyond the jurisdiction of her own Archbishops. A memorial similar in tenor to Dean Luckock's is now in process of signature in the diocese of Chester, where also it has been promoted by the Dean.

The new Local Government Act will evidently have the effect of adding many clergymen to the magistracy, a result hardly intended by its framers. The chairmen of vestries in London and of district councils in the country are ex-officio justices of the peace. Among the clerical chairmen elected in London are the vicars of St. George's, Hanover-square, Kensington, Islington, and Paddington, and these gentlemen have become magistrates of the county for the term of their presidency.

It has been stated in the daily papers that the Princess Christian, on Holy Innocents' Day, laid the foundation of a new Church-room in connection with St. Matthew's, Bayswater. The cost will be about £2,100. The vicar of St. Matthew's, the Rev. E. A. Stuart, in his sermon on Sunday morning, said that during the past year the number of communicants had been nearly doubled.

The managers of Church schools will surely make every effort to avoid turning them over to school boards, in face of such an example as that which we quote from a sermon lately preached by the rector of Flint, reported in the *National Church*. It is true that English school-boards are not likely to be composed of such fanatics against religious teaching as are often to be found in Wales; but the law is the same in England as in Wales, and what has happened in one case might happen in others. Here is the story, as it was told by the rector, the Rev. W. Ll. Nicholas; if it is not true, we shall be glad to publish an authenticated contradiction:—

A large Church school was handed over to a school-board. The schoolmaster, a man greatly respected in the neighbourhood, was retained. In the school the master had Biblical instruction and the Lord's Prayer in the morning, the singing of the Doxology at the close of the morning school, and the Evening Hymn at the close of the afternoon school. The first order from the board was, "Give up all Biblical instruction"; the second, "Give up the Doxology and the Evening Hymn"; and the third, "Give up the Lord's Prayer." After that the conscientious master told the children that every morning there would be perfect silence for two minutes, so that any child who wished could say the Lord's Prayer. The board then gave its final order, "Give up private prayer."

The Sisterhood of the Holy Childhood is the name of a new religious community of women, who, as certificated teachers, are prepared to take up the teaching of the children in Church elementary schools. Its beginnings at Cowley are recorded in the current number of the *Cowley Evangelist*. "The need for a Brotherhood of men," the editor of the *Evangelist* remarks, "united together as religious for similar work," is equally pressing."

THE many friends of Mrs. Lake who have been associated with her in her works of benevolence and charity during the years she resided at the Deanery, Durham, presented her on New Year's Day with a St Cuthbert's cross in diamonds, as a memorial of their appreciation of her long and faithful friendship, and of her personal courtesy and kindness towards all classes of society in Durham.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE HUMANITARIAN." January, 1895. Wilkinson & Co.

THIS is an excellent number. Mr. A. W. Pinero gives his portrait, and his opinions both on the art which he practises with such skill and on some of the social problems that are now agitating thoughtful minds. He thinks that "the New Woman" does not differ much from her sisters of former days, and refers the reader to Imogen, Portia, and Rosalind. Mr. Beerbohm Tree gives his views on "The Sunday Question"; the Relations of the Sexes, at present a most important subject, is discussed by Sir W. Vavasour, and there are a couple of articles on Domestic Life in Morocco and Japan which we especially commend to the attention of our lady readers. That in Japan is said to be all happiness. We should much like to have the writer's views confirmed or refuted. It is, as it stands, a strong argument for following the instincts of nature, and for plural marriage, with proper restrictions and adequate protection for the female and her offspring. Lady Trelawny seeks to interest people in the excellent theatrical mission for ballet girls and others engaged on the stage. St. George Mivart continues his excellent papers on Heredity, which we propose to notice separately, and the Hon. Mrs. Henry Chetwynd forcibly replies to a recent article on "The Depopulation of the Highlands."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

PARISH COUNCILS.

SIR,—Our parochial experience is interesting, and a little exceptional. I refused to "stand," and did not even attend the parish meeting, because—(1) I am not well versed in the Act; (2) I think an incumbent should fill no office except by almost unanimous consent—some years ago I was proposed and chosen guardian of the poor, after saying "I refuse to accept office unless chosen unanimously"; and (3) because I am glad to be unburdened in social matters. My son was elected without the canvas of a single vote.

The interest comes in here. The votes for Church candidates were 265, as against 241 for Nonconformist candidates; the votes for Liberal candidates were 314, as against 192 Conservative. Only 88 voted out of a possible 150, and the 88 gave only about 5½ votes apiece, though entitled to 7. The council consists of two Conservative Churchmen, two Liberal Churchmen, a Baptist, a Wesleyan, and a Primitive Methodist. The peculiar element is, you will observe, and so will some of your readers, politically Liberal Churchmen. The Primitive was last on the list of elected, only two votes above a decidedly Tory Churchman. There were eight rejected candidates, including three Conservative Churchmen and five Liberal Nonconformists. The question of a semi-Church charity may bring tug-of-war, the most influential Nonconformist remarking to my son, "You see we can't count upon keeping the doctor (meaning me) as our vicar for ever, or we could soon settle it in a friendly way." S. B. JAMES.

Northmarston, January 3rd, 1895.

THE Laud Exhibition in the Schoolroom of All Hallows Barking, E.C., has by no means disappointed those who first projected it, and promises to justify, even considered by itself, all the interest which the Laud Commemoration has aroused. Naturally, it is not a large exhibition; the total number of exhibits is little over a hundred; but there are probably not a few persons who will be able to study it with the more satisfaction and profit on that account. And within the walls of Mr. J. L. Pearson's really beautiful schoolroom are gathered together treasures well worthy of careful study. The case which occupies the centre of the room contains the most precious treasures. Here are collected the Archbishop's MS. "History of his Troubles" (a noble quarto volume), and the strangely-shaped "Diary," a very long and narrow volume, closely written in Laud's bold and easily legible hand. Here, too, is the precious MS. "Devotions" of Bishop Andrewes, his own copy, "watered with his tears," which the saintly Bishop, as a note upon its cover informs us, himself gave to Laud—no small tribute, by the way, to the devout character of the great Archbishop himself. The case also contains the beautifully shaped chalice which Laud, then Bishop of London, gave to the Chapel of Holy Trinity, Knightsbridge, when he first licensed a curate to the chapelry; the tortoise, sole remaining relic of that love of domestic pets of which the "Diary" tells us, and other objects having a personal connection with him. The personal objects, however, are by no means confined to the central case; elsewhere are to be seen the finely-carved chair and bookcase doors, both of which were once in the possession of St. John's, Oxford (which would seem to have been no very faithful custodian); and the Archbishop's cap and the ivory-headed stick of ebony which supported his steps to the scaffold. A fitting reply to the rather wilfully ignorant assumption of some of the newspapers that the commemoration has a political bearing is given by the contents of another case, where devotion, loyalty, and freedom are symbolised together by a "Little Gidding Book" (one of those remarkable subject concordances to the Bible produced at the famous Anglican monastery in Buckinghamshire), one of the two shirts worn by Charles I. on the scaffold, and (what would seem to be) Prynne's brief against Laud at his trial. And other cases, again, show a collection of letters and other papers of Laud, Juxon, and Williams which must be nearly unique; a collection of the illustrated tracts for and against the Primate which teemed from this press at this time; a specimen collection of books which once belonged to him; of the original editions of his own writings, and a number of illustrative books and objects from various sources. Another section of the exhibition is devoted to pictures, engravings, and the like. The absence of the magnificent Lambeth portrait by Van Dyck is almost, but not quite, atoned for by the presence of the best portrait of St. John's, which, it is impossible to doubt, is also by Van Dyck. The exhibition also contains very excellent portraits of King Charles, of Strafford and Juxon, "Keeper" Williams and Pococke, the first holder of Laud's Readership in Arabic—whose present successor, by the way, is among the lecturers in the commemoration. And not least in interest is a large number of engraved portraits (those of the Archbishop himself being especially noticeable) and views of the churches which he served and other places with which he was specially connected.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkins, Rev. Lancelot White, M.A.; Vicar of Holyrood, Southampton.

Bartlett, Rev. Thomas Willis Butler, Vicar of Kempston; Rector of Beeston-next-Mileham, Norfolk (by dispensation).

Bickersteth, Rev. M. Cyril, M.A.; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Bluett, Rev. Nugent Lovel, M.A.; Vicar of Great Redisham, Suffolk.

Boultbee, Rev. T. F., M.A., Vicar of Loddiswell; Secretary of the National Society for Woodleigh Deanery.

Bowly, Rev. C. H., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Clapham-rise; Secretary of the National Society for Clapham Deanery.

Buckle, Rev. Canon G., M.A.; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Chevassût, Rev. F. G., Curate of Holy Trinity, Blackburn; Vicar of Langho.

Connor, Rev. M. Mitchell, M.A., Vicar of West Bromwich, and Hon. Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield; Rural Dean of West Bromwich.

Davies, Rev. George Herbert D., Curate; Rector of Kelsale-cum-Carlton. Suffolk.

Duke, Rev. William Alexander, B.A., Vicar of Debenham, Suffolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Dymond, Rev. Henry Newton, M.A.; Rector of Chaffcombe, Somersetshire.

Eady, Rev. Albert Arthur, M.A.; Rector of Saxlingham-by-Holt, and Rector of Setheringsett, Norfolk (by dispensation).

Everingham, Rev. W.; Diocesan Secretary of the Salisbury Diocesan Communicants' Guild.

Foord, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Kirk Ella-with-Anlaby, Hull; Rural Dean of Howden.

Gace, Rev. F. A. J., R.N.; Chaplain to the *Melampus*.

Gibson, Rev. Prebendary E. C. S., M.A., Principal of Wells Theological College; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Glennie, Rev. R. G., M.A., Resident Chaplain to the Archbishop of York; Vicar of Egton, Yorkshire.

Graham, Rev. Charles S., A.B.; Incumbent of Turlough, Diocese of Tuam.

Greer, Rev. Richard Ussher, A.M.; Incumbent of St. Michael's, Belfast.

Hall, Rev. W., R.N.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Endymion*.

Hodgson, Rev. J. H., M.A., Rector of St. Swithun's, Winchester; Secretary of the National Society for Winchester Deanery.

Holden, Rev. Joseph, Curate of Runcorn; Vicar of Antrobus, Cheshire.

Holmes, Rev. Samuel Stephen, A.B.; Incumbent of Groomsport, county Down.

Housecroft, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Wickham Market, and Rural Dean; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Hunter, Rev. Robert Alexander; Rector of St. John's, Maddermarket, Norwich.

Jenkins, Rev. M. E., B.A., Vicar of Egton; Vicar of Sherburn-in-Elmet-with-Lotherton, Yorkshire.

Johnson, Rev. H., Incumbent of St. Cyprian's, Durban; Honorary Canon of Maritzburg.

Jones, Rev. David, B.A.; Rector of Anmer, Norfolk.

Lee, Rev. John Thomas, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Whittlesea; Rector of Glatton, Hunts.

Livett, Rev. G. M., Precentor of Rochester Cathedral; Vicar of Wateringbury, Kent.

Macran, Rev. Frederick Walker, B.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Drogheda; Incumbent of Middletown, Diocese of Armagh.

Moore, Rev. Charles, R.N.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Britannia*.

Napier, Rev. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Westminster; Secretary of the National Society for the Deanery of St. Margaret's and St. John's, Westminster.

Norris, Rev. George, B.A.; Vicar of North Elmham, Norfolk.

Northbridge, Rev. John, A.B.; Incumbent of St. Aidan's, Belfast.

Obbard, Rev. A. N., M.A., Rector of All Saints, Southampton; Rector of Chilbolton, Hants.

Phipps, Rev. R., Diocesan Chaplain; Secretary of the General Committee of the Wakefield Diocesan Societies.

Raven, Rev. B. W., Vicar of Leiston-with-Sizewell, Suffolk; Rural Dean of Dunwich (South District).

Robinson, Rev. T. W., R.N.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Caubrian*.

Reynolds, Rev. Sydney Montgomery, M.A., Curate of St. Ignatius's, Hendon, Sunderland; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Durham.

Roe, Rev. Robert Gordon, M.A.; Rector of Blo Norton, Norfolk.

Shilcock, Rev. William Alfred, M.A.; Rector of Chew Stoke, Bristol.

Smith, Rev. William Morley, M.A., Rector of Homersfield-with-St, Cross, Suffolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Speed, Rev. H. F., Curate of St. James's, Poole; Rector of Yarmouth, Isle of Wight.

Still, Rev. John, M.A.; Rector of Hockwold-with-Wilton, Norfolk.

Stillman, Rev. William Beaufoy, M.A., Rector of Downham Market; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Swire, Rev. Arthur, Curate of St. Leonard's, Newark; Rector of Ridlington, Uppingham.

Todd, Rev. J. C., Diocesan Theological Tutor, Natal; Honorary Canon of Maritzburg.

Torrance, Rev. George William, M.D., Incumbent of Balaclava, Melbourne; Incumbent of St. John's. Melbourne.

Valpy, Rev. Arthur Sutton, M.A.; Canon Residentiary in Winchester Cathedral.

Vernon, Rev. J. R., M.A., Rector of St. Audrie's, Bridgewater; Prebendary of Itton in Wells Cathedral.

Ward, Rev. W. Carey, M.A.; Incumbent of St. Columb's, Hawthorn.

Waters, Rev. Robert Edward, A.B.; Incumbent of Knock-Columkille, Diocese of Armagh.

Watkins, Rev. T. B., M.A., Vicar of Herne Bay; Secretary of the National Society for Westbere Deanery.

Whalley, Rev. Pryor Buxton, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Lakenham; and Vicar of Arminghall, Norfolk (by dispensation from the Archbishop of Canterbury).

White, Rev. F. G. H. E., R.N.; Chaplain to the *Achilles*.

Whiting, Rev. Wykeham Herbert, B.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.

Wilson, Rev. James, M.A., Rector of Barking-cum-Darmiden, and Vicar of Needham Market; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Woodhouse, Rev. Reginald Illingworth, M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Bromley-common; Rector of Merstham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bertie, the Hon. and Rev. Henry William, D.C.L., late Vicar of Great Ilford, and Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, at Oxford, on the 31st ult., aged 82.

Chamberlain, Rev. Robert, M.A., formerly for many years Curate-in-Charge of Woodstone, Huntingdonshire, at 1, The Mount, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 2nd inst., in the 81st year of his age.

D'Alton, Rev. E. S., M.A., and ex-Scholar, T.C.D., late Chaplain and Naval Instructor H.M.S. *Benbow*, at Pallazzo Villa, Nova Largo, Mondragone, Naples, on the 26th ult.

Duncan, Rev. James, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Canterbury Cathedral, and for twenty years Secretary to the National Society, at the Precincts, Canterbury, on the 7th inst.

Grindrod, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Alne-with-Aldwark, Easingwold, Yorkshire, on the 15th ult.

Guille, Rev. George de Carteret, M.A., Seigneur of St. George, Guernsey, late Rector of Little Torrington, at 36, Hauteville, Guernsey, on the 2nd inst., aged 80.

Hogarth, Rev. Henry, M.A., formerly Vicar of Hatfield, Doncaster, at Hatfield, on the 31st ult., aged 93.

Hunter, Rev. William, late Rector of Norbury, Ashbourne, at The Firs, Inner Park-road, Wimbledon-common, on the 1st inst., aged 80.

Jeffcock, Rev. J. T., Rector of St. Peter's Collegiate Church, Wolverhampton, at the Rectory, Waterloo-road, on the 1st inst., aged 63.

Linzee, Rev. Edward Hood, formerly Incumbent of Bracknell, at Forest Lodge, Bracknell, on the 2nd ult., aged 79.

Lowe, Rev. Henry Edward, M.A., formerly of Atherstone and Wilmcote, Stratford-on-Avon, at Torquay, on the 1st inst., aged 80.

Macaulay, Rev. Daniel, B.A., for many years Vicar of Holy Trinity, New Town, Bishop Stortford, on the 4th inst., aged 77.

Vincent, Rev. F. A., B.D., late Rector, Elsted, Sussex, Ladbroke, Warwickshire and Vicar of St. Chad's, Stafford at Upper Tooting, on the 22nd ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

NATURAL LAW AND SPIRITUAL LAW.

By Canon H. SCOTT-HOLLAND.

Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, January 6th, 1895.

"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them has He set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. . . . The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple."—Psalm xxix. 1—5 and 7.

THESE words, which are on our lips every Christmas morning, are just as new and strong to-day as when they were first spoken two thousand years ago. Nothing can be more strange than that the amazing advances of scientific knowledge, which have reversed absolutely the relations of earth and sun and stars to one another, and have opened out analyses of distance and scales of orbit which paralyse the imagination by an immensity in which measurement has become purely symbolic, should have had no power at all to drive away the immortal freshness of this early vision of the Psalmist, who looked out upon the scene with the eyes of a simplicity which was at once direct and manly and profound. He seized with the poet's intuition on those eternal aspects which constitute the heart of the matter, and which stamp its unchanging character. He took it as the eyes gave it, undisturbed by the timidities with which a more subtle knowledge might have left him haunted and perturbed. What he saw he apprehended, and what he apprehended he spoke out; and from his sight and from his speech he purged away all that was local and wilful, and accidental and temporary, or particular. And, therefore, he brushes past the bound of that perilous middle ground where he might collide with further science. He could no more collide with it than our sight of the earth and the heavens to-day can be complicated by any such collision. What we see, we see, and rightly, science offers no objection. We see the sun rise, we see it set; we see the stars walk abroad at night, and as revealed in that sight it stands, and it speaks, and it is real. Nothing has falsified its direct relations to us. It is to-day exactly what it was to the first wondering shepherds who lay on lonely hills and watched the strange and silent movements that peopled the wide darkness of the heavens above their heads. Still that vast and ordered host of stars pass before our eyes without a sound, and still that soundless motion speaks without voice, so that all may understand. And then, again, that mighty pageant of the morning rehearses its part in all its ancient splendour. What, indeed, can ever dim its resounding wonder, that leap of the sun from its hidden bed, coming forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, rejoicing as a strong man to run his course! Nothing has happened to diminish its reality. It needs no gloss or qualification. Still it thrills the souls of each new-born generation, exactly as at the first dawn, when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. And it is, we know, noticeable in passing, that the very period in which science has given such astounding development to our astronomical knowledge should also have been marked by a poetical development which, through the genius of Wordsworth, restored to us that primitive vision of nature with a purity, an austerity, and a vitality which has never been paralleled since the Psalms were written. Through him we see again the earth and sky as the Psalmist saw them. We see them not as under the conceits of a rhetorical emotion which can afford to disregard science only because its purpose is so superficial and trifling. That is precisely the conception of poetry which Wordsworth overthrew. He renewed its seriousness; he stripped it of poetic fiction; he made us see nature as men who are being disciplined for eternity, who can allow themselves no idle dreams, being far too much in earnest to take the beauty of nature as the plaything of a passing hour—men who abhor shows and outward vanities, and who press through by strenuous patience into the deep heart of things. It was no rhetorician, no emotional sentimentalist, who found, in that primæval outlook over the things of the earth, the solidity of a revelation. It was in the service, in the solemn service, of modern duty that he sang in words that breathed the innermost spirit of my text—

> Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong,
> And the most ancient heavens through them are fresh and strong.

This immediate outlook upon nature, then, is independent of scientific elaboration. It is unalterable by intellectual mutations and advances; it rests on those permanent relations which hold between the soul of man within and the world without. Yet what I would more specially notice to-day is, that the whole stress of the Psalm is laid on that aspect of the natural world which it is the work of science to emphasize and to extricate. For what is it that fills the singer with such awe as he looks out upon the starry hosts or at the sun leaping from

his bed? What is it that makes him so confident that "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork"? It is just the characteristic on which science fastens. It is the manifestation of law, of regularity, of reason. His eyesight turning its native simplicity upon the scene before him is quite enough to reveal to him this rude secret which it is the whole duty of science to elucidate, this august rhythm, so firm, and so tireless, in which the endless succession of day and night proceed. This it is which overpowers him, "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge" —each arrives at its turn without disorder, without accident, or chance, or perplexity. There is about it all, as the mighty drama discloses itself, the calmness, the majesty, of rational knowledge. Each arrival, each departure is known, is appointed, is certified. The day dies, but not as if it were lost or had blundered on its road. It passes off the stage on its delegated way, sure of its path fulfilled, quiet in the security that another will succeed in its due turn. And though the night wrack roll up ragged and brown, yet it is no dark enemy for all that, no shadow of death pressing with ominous dismay upon the heels of a flying light; night comes as a friend, as the companion of the day. It is moved by the will, governed by the same hand, and all the same signs of conscious intelligence are about it. It is heavy with unutterable speech. And then the night, the night which might seem like some terrible shadow flung across our lives, some doom that would swallow us up into vacancy—look at it!—it is full from end to end with reassuring voices, for out move those glorious stars, each in its set order, each according to its office. Not one faileth of all those thousand thousands. Although night takes up again that unbroken march and repeats the unvarying tale, as sheep follow a shepherd, so those hosts all move after some lordly voice that calleth them all by their name. And that awful silence in which the tremendous scene proceeds is more eloquent than words. No shouts are needed to marshal them into their places, or to signal to them the order of their coming, or rescue them from confusion or rout. Without sound each enters, passes, disappears, so fixed, so absolute the certainty of their motion.

Is not this silent security? Is it not that that makes them so conscious and so significant? Those heavens look out at us with all their starry eyes, as if they would say with one voice, "We know what goes forward; we know; all the secret is with us; all is well, trust God, be not afraid." So it is felt, charged with speech, this dumb night; it strains and pulses on the verge of words which it withholds. Dumb is the vault, yet filled with voices that toll in our ears, voices that cry without a language, and assure us of that eternal consciousness which possesses the entire rounds of the heavens, whose rule and line goeth out throughout all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world. This universality, this intelligent regularity, there is no limit to it, beyond which all will become doubtful and uncertain. As far as imagination can go, still the same reasonable law holds good, still those ordained successions proceed, still all move along allotted pathways, still the evidence of conscious thought meets the searching gaze, still it is as if the round earth everywhere were trembling on the verge of speech. This language of theirs which is heard in the silence reaches unto the very ends of the world. And so, too, with this leaping sun, this bridegroom, which travels with such steady precision, with such unfaltering certainty, along the course set before him. It also never comes to the close of its mission, it also is universal in its range. Its goings forth is from the uttermost part of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it, and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof. Universal law acting in silence, with absolute security of rhythm.

That is the vision which overawes the Psalmist; and is not that the very essence of our scientific presentation of Nature? Law acting in silence, that is Nature as science discloses it. Silently, in dumb show, world within world of intricate law work out their allotted transformations. We look upon the strange and busy process, as in and out, with sure accuracy, all ply their business. Most amazing! But it is dumb, some say, as they gaze; it tells nothing, it works, works in a silence that is as death; there is no voice, neither any to answer; it offers no interpretation of itself, it suggests no language and responds to no thought; it is dumb mechanism beating out an aimless task. Nay, we cry, with the Psalmist, silent it may be, but this perfect law, this undeviaitng order, this calm precision, this infinite regularity of succession, this steady certainty of movement, this unbroken universality, these disciplined forces, this rhythmic harmony, this balance, this precaution, this response of day to day and night to night, that is intelligence, that is reason, that is consciousness, that is speech! No one can face it in its wholeness, part answering to part, and each to all, without becoming aware of its mystic eloquence. It all speaks, speaks as it works, speaks without a language, speaks without a sound. Reason answers to reason as deep to deep. There may be no speech or language in these dumb motions, but for all that voices are heard among them, their sound goes out unto all the lands, and their words unto the ends of the world. So much for the vision of nature; and then comes the Psalmist's momentous advance.

As he watches with solemn glee this stupendous world of natural law, he finds that he has but to lift his eyes, and then above it, beyond it, about it, allied to it, a corresponding world opens out—

a world, too, of law, of certainty, of regularity, of order, no less than the world of nature. Still here, too, the same harmonies hold good, the same successions move in appointed sequence; part answers to part, and every part to the whole. Here, too, all is sane, rational, secure, quiet, and sure, as the silent stars in the night; this great work proceeds according to allotted precautions, by rule and measure and mind, punctual and precise as the sun moving without his chamber in the morning. This higher order of life moves along the course set before it, and its laws never flag nor fail; no chance confuses it, and no unruly accident disturbs it. Man can count on these laws with the same absolute validity as that with which he counts on sunrise or on sunset. And what is this wonderful world that spreads away on every side to this ancient watcher of the skies? What are these undeviating laws which lay themselves alongside of those unbroken uniformities which govern the stars in their courses? My brethren, we know it is the world of consciousness, the world of the moral law, the world of the religious spirit, the world of the fear of the Lord. Without a jar or break he passes over into this world from his contemplation of the stars, so near is it, this spiritual life to the natural, so entirely congenial with it, so closely knit together! Follow on with the Psalm, and you know what I mean. It is to him as if it were impossible to enter into the contemplation of nature in its ordered regularity without the soul finding itself full in face of this higher law; so smooth is the transaction, so instinctive the recognition of the alliance. While the light of that glorious sun is still before our eyes, we have passed in within this new domain of the moral spirit, and we are acknowledging that the fear of the Lord is an undefiled law converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure and giveth wisdom unto the simple; the statutes of the Lord are right and rejoice the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure and giveth light unto the eyes, and the fear of the Lord is clean and endureth for ever. Laws, statutes, testimonies, commandments—no physical world could be based on grounds more fixed and uniform and sure. Everywhere precision, everywhere unalterable rigour—that is what delights him. That is why the statutes rejoice his heart, that is why this law gives wisdom and light to the eyes. It is sure, it never changes, it endureth for ever. These judgments are true, are real; therefore they are "more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also are they than honey in the honeycomb." Through their universal veracity they allow for instructed and disciplined knowledge, and it is this which invokes the attention of the rejoicing reason. "By them is Thy servant taught, and in keeping of them there is great reward." Error, wrong, sin—these may be on his own side, but this does not shake the absolute authority of this reign of law without him. Only it makes him tremble lest even unwittingly he may have introduced any quiver of disturbance into this fabric of exquisite and harmonious order. Who can tell how oft he offended, "O, cleanse Thou me from secret faults."

My brethren, can we recover at all for ourselves this mental temper of the Psalmist? This world of which he is speaking is what we name spiritual, religious, supernatural, and as soon as we have touched such names as these we are but too apt to recall something wholly unlike Nature, wholly opposed to scientific law or the necessities of reason, something utterly unsteady, unfixed, unaccountable, in violent collision, perhaps, with the undeviating certainties of physical nature. Yet the Psalm supposes that the recognition of law in nature governing its silent successions is the very road by which to pass to the true recognition of the law of God, which is the life of the spirit, which is religion. Veracity, regularity, universality, these are the very notes of the Divine action in both spheres, and in both, therefore, there is the same ground for reason to work upon. Through the uniformity of law in both it can arrive at instructed knowledge, and since in type of character the two worlds are knit so fast together by intimate correspondence, therefore the one is the best key to the other. Nature will enable us to understand the supernatural. "Ah, but that is miracle," you say; "the supernatural is miraculous, and the miraculous is the defiance of reason, of nature, of scientific law. Faith is based on miracle, that is why we have split with the Psalmist." Now that last statement we know must be false, for the Christian faith cannot split with the Psalms. Its whole appeal lies to them; it has pledged itself to be identical in spirit, in essence, with theirs; the faith which believes in Jesus Christ must be able to identify itself absolutely with that faith in God which is disclosed in the Psalms of the Old Testament. Those in whom our faith first sprang to life were steeped to the lips in the language of the Psalms, and our own faith, in its devoted and passionate love of the Psalms ever since, has given the indisputable proof that it finds its own character, its own form, its own essence in their way of viewing life. The temper in which the Psalmist looked at Nature is certainly included and retained in the mind of the Christian faith. And if, then, it believes in miracle, it must mean that belief in Nature lands it in miracle.

Miracle in its Christian shape must be in absolute harmony with the unswerving continuity of Nature, for that is the faith of the Psalmist, and that is exactly what we assert. We assert that just as the Psalmist, through his amazed delight in the ordered sequences of Nature, found himself engaged in contemplating the laws of God for the soul—the fear of the Lord—so have we in the power of the same faith. Following up the story

of man's origin and development, and sin and weakness, we find ourselves to have arrived at belief in the incarnation of Jesus Christ, in His virgin birth, in His resurrection from the dead. That is the touchstone of true miracle. The belief in it springs out of the same sources, capacities, and convictions by which you believe in the Divine witness of natural law. Grant that, you possess a certain spiritual instinct which at sight of the smooth journey of the sun across the heavens compels you to move forward and pronounce, "I believe in God; the heavens declare His glory, and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

Well, it is to that very same instinct that we would make our appeal. We challenge you to say whether, as you press on under the discipline incurred by sin and sorrow, that same instinct does not bring you under the like necessity of pronouncing, "I believe in Jesus Christ, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost." For, at all costs, we Christians hold that the God of Nature and the God of miracle are one God, and that of necessity, therefore, the two must hang together. They must constitute one harmonious whole; they cannot be at variance with one another; they must witness to the same origin, the same principles of work, the same creative character. A miracle, therefore, can be no true miracle which does not tend to confirm our faith in natural law, strengthen our trust in reason, and vitalise our confidence in the supremacy of an ordering mind, governing all things in intelligible order. That is the temper of our dear Lord and Master, our Lord Jesus Christ, so sane, so self-controlled, so confident in the steady and quiet motions of nature, which was His own Father's peculiar handiwork, He told us, in which and with which He works in intimate security, in entire correspondence, in rational unity of will and purpose.

That is the Christian temper. Our faith in Christ Jesus lays large and unfaltering trust in the veracity of human faculties, in the solidity of knowledge, in the reality of an instructed and intelligent experience. And every Christian Church that has attempted to utilise some hour of intellectual panic or despair in order to appeal to that deep seated pagan passion for the miraculous which springs out of childish ignorance or irrational doubt, or delirious credulity, is committing not only a crime against reason, but also an outrage upon faith!

Beloved, I would implore you, base your belief in Jesus on the convictions that form the ground of your confidence in the stability and reality of life. Base it on that which is soundest in your reasonable manhood, on that which is most wholesome, most assured in your thought; build it there as on solid land, not on the vague seas of your doubt and mistrust! Only remember, such a belief so based must be serious, must be austere, for it implies that this world of the conscience and of the spirit is governed by laws as fixed and sure, as universal, as those which govern the order of nature. There is no trifling with these, no trusting to luck or to chance. As fire burns, as water runs, so the fear of the Lord holds on its way with undeviating certitude. Look up at the strong sun moving through its unalterable successions! It cometh, we say, from the uttermost part of the earth, and runneth about unto the ends of the world, and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof. It is the very type of necessity. "Sure as the sun in the heavens, sure as the sun will rise to-morrow," so we say. Just such is the law of the Lord, the law of the moral life. It works with the same relentless accuracy, with the same clearness, with the same persistence; nothing can hold it back or turn it aside, or hide it, or deny it, or escape it, or defy it. There is nothing hid from the heat thereof. On and on it bears down upon us, and its light pierces, and embraces, and searches, and reveals! We must stand in it! The soul is laid bare under it, wrapped round by that dread heat which burns its way in! Nothing can be hid! Oh, the severity of such a searching fire! Who can relieve the strain? Who can soften the flame? What may not we be proved to have done under such a scrutiny! Alas, we tremble with the Psalmist, we lift up his cry, "Who can tell how oft he offendeth?" O, my God, Who alone can make me fit to meet Thy most strict demands, Who alone can order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, of Thy great mercy, cleanse me from my secret thoughts!

Austere the message, but it has its comfort too. For the law of God has broken the silence in which the laws of nature plied their work. So dreadful that dumbness! Dumb the mighty sun, rushing on its flaming journey; dumb the vault of heaven with its speechless stars. Voices trembled on the verge, but they never came to our ears; and the silence has terrified men until in their panic they have deemed the dumb world Godless. But now at last there is a voice heard! After wind and fire and earthquake have come and gone, lo, there is a still small voice! It is the speech of God, heard low and sweet by the heart of the child. Through the law of the moral life God speaks, and our hearing, our understanding of that Divine speech we name Conscience. Conscience is our waking response to a speaking God; conscience is that which will start up from its slumber in the night and listen and cry, "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth." Oh, the blessing of listening to that speech, the immeasurable relief of hearing at last a living voice in the silence! God has spoken a living speech to a living soul. Oh, listen, listen, listen! Is He not speaking now? That brooding nature has found its voice! What is it which it says so clear, so strong, so true? We know well enough. God spake these words and said, "I am

the Lord thy God; thou shalt have none other God but Me; thou shalt not murder, thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself." So He speaks, and conscience hears. The statutes of the Lord are right, and rejoice the heart; the commandment of the Lord is sure, and giveth wisdom to the simple. Oh, to-day if ye hear His voice harden not your hearts!

SPIRITUAL STRENGTH.

By the Rev. B. W. Randolph, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Ely and Hon. Canon of Lincoln.

Sermon Preached in the Chapel of Keble College on Advent Sunday, 1894.

"Be strong in the Lord."—Eph. vi. 19.

IT is remarkable how often in the Bible this exhortation is given to God's servants—"Be strong." Not be good, be holy, be just, be pure—these are given, and these we should expect to find; but here is an exhortation which, perhaps, we should not expect, "Be strong"; and yet, I say, it occurs comparatively often. When, after Moses' death, Joshua found himself the leader of the chosen people, three times over God gave him this command: "Be strong and of a good courage";* "Only be thou strong and very courageous"; "Be strong and of a good courage, be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed." Similarly, nearly five hundred years later, when David lay dying, he bequeaths this command to his son Solomon †—"I go the way of all the earth; be thou strong therefore, and show thyself a man." Pass on another five hundred years, when, in the third year of Cyrus, visions were vouchsafed to Daniel, which well-nigh overwhelmed him; then, he says, came one like unto the appearance of the sons of men, and touched me and said, "O man, greatly beloved, fear not; peace be unto thee: be strong, yea, be strong." A little later, after the Captivity, when the first freshness of their zeal had passed away, and the returned exiles had begun to grow lukewarm in their efforts to rebuild the temple, Haggai, the prophet, was sent to encourage them in these words, "Yet now, be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord, and be strong, O Joshua, the son of Josedech, the high priest; and be strong, all ye people of the land"; ‡ and here, St. Paul, as he finishes his epistle to the Ephesians, uses the same expression: "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might."

I.—What does the Apostle mean? There are three faculties in man to which this exhortation might apply: three faculties.

The words might apply (*a*) physically. Physical strength, strength of limb, is a great gift of God. Conceivably it might be a good thing to tell men to whom God has given this kind of strength: Don't tamper with this gift of physical strength; don't abuse it by excess of sin—there is a right way of using it and a wrong way—"Be strong in the Lord." But the Apostle is not thinking of this kind of strength. (*b*) Another great faculty in man (to which words like these might be addressed) is mental power, the intellectual power. It is a much higher gift than mere physical strength. It is a strength in which (unlike physical strength) no other animal on this earth shares. Mental power is immeasurably higher than mere physical power, and it would certainly be a piece of good advice to say to any one who has mental power: Do your utmost to use it, to develop it; it is a talent for which you will be held accountable at the last day. Don't neglect it, don't misuse it. There is a right use of intellectual strength and a wrong one. "Be strong in the Lord." But the Apostle is not thinking (except, indeed, indirectly) of this kind of power. (*c*) There is another power in man—the highest kind of power—as high above merely mental power as that is above mere physical power—without which, indeed, both physical and mental power must be disastrously misused—that is moral power, spiritual power, the power of character. The power of character is, I say, the highest kind of power, the power of moral choice. It is man's special prerogative. It means that man has got the power of free will, implying choice, and, further, that this power of choice brings with it a sense of right and wrong. We can't distinguish right and wrong simply as we distinguish colours on a wall as red or black; the words "ought" and "ought not" come in with this distinction; they mean that we are morally responsible beings. That is man's highest prerogative, and it is this power or faculty which the Apostle mainly addresses when he says, "Be strong in the Lord." How can we best carry out this command? It is Advent Sunday, and you will allow me to address myself to this question quite simply, practically. How can we be men of strong character?

II.—(*a*) By remembering in the first place that this gift of character is the most important possession that we have. For consider what is character. It is the stamp or impress that a man bears upon himself. By a man of good character, or of Christian character, we mean a man who bears a good Christian mark or impress upon him—upon him—not merely upon his features, which may or may not reflect accurately the character, but upon him, upon the inner shrine of his being, and a man is modifying this mark upon himself in one direction or another every day; every day he is, as it were, engraving a mark or stamp on the tables of his heart. Each week, each year,

* Josh. i. 6, 7, 9. † 1 Kings ii. 2. ‡ Hag. ii. 4.

this engraving is either becoming more what God would have it be or less, according as it more or less reflects the perfect model of human life revealed in the Gospel. It is a picture which we are painting upon the inner recesses of our being, and each day or week we are either making the picture more beautiful or we are marring it. Now, we shall be strong if we remember that the gift of character is the most important possession that we have. Nothing that we have, no office we shall ever hold, can be compared in importance to character. All that we have—money, influence, friends, position—are outside our real selves. We cannot take them out of this world. We must needs leave them behind us when we die. We call them ours while they last; but they pass away. But with character it is different. Character does not pass away. Among all the possessions which a man has or may have—money, prospect, friends, high place, all these he leaves behind at death; but character he takes with him. The character mark that he has been impressing upon himself month after month as the years have sped along, this he takes with him, and must take, beyond this world; he carries it into the next; it does not leave him at death; he stands with it before the judgment seat of God. Everything else is outside man—character is himself.

(*b*) Once more, we can best carry out the Apostle's advice by remembering that to be strong implies that we must expect to fight. We can't drift through life. As we look back on life, half of our failures have been due to this. We have forgotten, so to say, that there are two men within us—the higher, the lower, the flesh and the spirit—and if we would be the men Almighty God intended us to be, we must insist on the higher man ruling the lower. We fail again and again because we have become the victims of a servile war—because the passions, which God intended to be our slaves, have revolted, and the higher faculties in man have become the slaves of the lower. This is not to be strong, it is to be miserably weak. The passions and appetites were intended to be under the control of the higher man within us; and this means a struggle—self-discipline, self-restraint, self-mastery, preparing the way for self-devotion; it means that a man must resolve to be master in his own house, to keep back and keep under sensuality and sloth and excess; to make the body the obedient servant of the soul, the flesh the slave of the spirit. This is to be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might.

(*c*) Once more, remember St. Paul says "Be strong in the Lord." Another chief cause of failure is because we have leaned so little on God. As we look back on life, if half our failures are due to allowing the flesh to have the initiative, how many are due to want of watchfulness, to too much self-reliance? We have gone forth, so to say, in our own strength; we have underestimated our own weakness, and so we have not avoided occasions of sin. Remember Bishop Andrewes's prayer, "Crucify the occasions of my sins." It is no part of true prudence to underestimate the strength of the enemy; that is an axiom of earthly warfare. It is the same in the moral sphere. It is no part of true manliness to underestimate the forces arrayed against us. To be strong in the Lord often means to take a due measure of our own weakness; that is not to be strong in self, rather it is to lean on God. Great is the power of a humble heart which leans on God. We fail because we forget to lean on God. Think of the higher faculties God has given us: take the mind, with its powers of looking backward and forward, of remembering, and reflecting, and forecasting—take it and teach it to lean on God, Whom it was created to know: to know as the origin and goal of its being. To be strong in this way means a watchfulness over our thoughts, "casting down imagination and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into obedience to Christ." Take the affections: teach them to cleave to God and to others only in God, in God Whom they were created to love. This means watchfulness over the heart: "keep" the heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life. Take the will—the will, the master faculty of man's moral being—teach it to move in harmony with God's will, for which purpose it was made. This is to "be strong in the Lord."

III.—Advent Sunday is a day for a fresh start, for fresh beginnings. At this sacred season, as we look back and contemplate the first coming of our blessed Lord, so do we also look forward and reverently wait for His second coming; and for any one who is seriously endeavouring to measure the true significance of life, the most important question he can ask himself at such a season is this—How should I wish my Lord Jesus to find me when He comes again, as come He will? What should I wish my own character to be! Every one will reply, "I should like to have taught my spirit to rule my flesh; I should like to have learned to lean habitually on God; I should like my character to be strong." "Be strong in the Lord." The Apostle is not advising an impossibility. We cannot all be physically strong; we cannot all be intellectually strong; but we all, by the grace of God, can become strong in character. We can all be learning to die to the lower and live to the higher, to die to the flesh and to live to the Spirit, to die to self and live to God.

There lay in a garden near Milan, just about fifteen hundred years ago, a sensualised unbeliever, the victim and sport of the half-belief current at the close of the fourth century, tossed to and fro in an agony of doubt, unable to break away, so it seemed, from the grasp of old habits, which he had

yet learnt to despise and to condemn. As he lies there—you know the story—the voice of a child breaks upon his ear—"Tolle, lege; tolle, lege." "Checking the torrent of my tears," he says, "I arose, interpreting it to be no other than a Divine command. . . . . I seized the book, opened, and in silence read the passage upon which my eyes first fell. 'Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying, but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof.'"

Augustine, from a sensualised heretic, became a saint and doctor of the Church. This passage, in the Epistle to the Romans, let us recollect it, forms, and has for many ages formed, the Epistle for Advent Sunday. "I speak as to wise men: judge ye what I say." Strong men are wanted nowadays, whether in Church or State, whether among the clergy or laity; strong men, men of strong character, able to mould or to help others. Remember then, my brethren, we shall be able to mould and help others just in proportion as we have learned or are learning to master ourselves. But let us not deceive ourselves; it means hard work. No man has ever found it easy to master himself. The lower impulses, the desires and lusts—all that St. Paul calls the flesh, is so real to us, the attractions of the world, the allurements and vanities, all that St. John calls the pride of life, is so real to us. The forces of the evil one are so real round about us that self-mastery can never be easy. Hence the blessedness of times of reflection such as Advent. They are pauses in life mercifully provided for us in which we may take account of ourselves and note how we stand in our relation to the great issues which lie before us all — death, the next world, the last Judgment, eternity. It may be for any of us—it is most likely for some of us—the last Advent we shall spend on earth. Let us ask ourselves how we should wish to have strengthened our character if this should indeed be so.

A NEW language has just been added to the Bible Society's long list, bringing up the total number to over 320. This time, as in some other recent instances, the new version is for Africa. It is a translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew into Kisukuma, the language of the Basukuma people, whose country lies immediately south of the Victoria Nyanza.

IN the accounts of Sir John Thompson's funeral at Halifax, it is stated that after the Requiem Mass the choir, at Lord Aberdeen's request, sang the well-known hymn, by the late Canon Ellerton, "Now the labourer's task is o'er," and that the vast congregation, consisting of persons of all classes and creeds, heartily joined in it. It may be doubted whether the hymn, so familiar to English Churchmen, was ever before sung in a Roman Catholic cathedral. There is nothing, of course, in its phraseology to prevent its use by Christians of any denomination.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1895.

THE FUTURE OF VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

THE excitement created by the peculiar circumstances of the School Board election in London has withdrawn attention, more or less, from the elections in the rest of the country. And yet, as far as they have gone, they have been full of interest. The predominant feature, especially in the great towns of the North of England, is the popularity of the voluntary principle. This is so marked that in many of the principal towns the voluntary party has been left in the ascendant, and, as a rule, the changes, where they have occurred, have been rather to place a majority of voluntaryists upon the Boards than the reverse. This gains significance when it is borne in mind that the party now in office have worked in quite the opposite direction. They have assumed that the feeling of the country was against the voluntary schools. Acting on these grounds they have treated them with draconic severity. Mr. Acland, following instructions quite as much as inclination, has put the screw on to the voluntary schools in all possible ways. The result of the pressure has been that a surprising impetus has been given to the voluntary principle. A leading Radical journal, an organ of disestablishment and disendowment, distinctly and fanatically anti-Church, has lately calculated that in a short time fully half-a-million will have been raised and spent upon Church Schools alone. In this case, as ever, the seed of persecution has rapidly borne the fruit of enthusiasm. All England over, the voluntary schools are being levelled up, and have gained in efficiency and popularity.

Probably to this severity of administration, as much as anything, is due the victory of the voluntary

principle. Its friends have been stirred up. Otiose assent has given place to active sympathy. We learn how to value what we fear to lose. People who were lukewarm or apathetic about their schools so long as the existence of them seemed secure, have sprung to their support when they were threatened with extinction.

The Disestablishment campaign has played its part also. When all is said and done, the two movements, against the Church and against her schools, are seen to be in reality the same, both in motive and purpose. They are only another phase of the attack upon religion. The fight for the schools simply localizes the struggle of belief against unbelief, light against darkness, the Church against the world. School defence is Church defence, perhaps the most solid and enduring kind of defence.

Experience, too, has been another factor. For years and years men have been seeking progress by material means. The event has been disappointing on all sides. Materialistic science has failed to solve the problems it set itself. Its answers have been found to be no answers. We are as far off as ever from the why and the wherefore of things. Men so distinguished as the late G. J. Romanes have, at the last, come round again to the positions upon which they turned their backs disdainfully twenty years ago. The things unseen and eternal have not been disposed of. After all social science has followed much the same course. It has become more and more evident that the destiny of mankind cannot be worked out completely on the lines of mere gregariousness, by considering only physical and intellectual interests. Clearer demonstration may yet be required in some directions, but the main facts are getting pretty plain. Increased political power, advanced facilities of education and mental culture, unprecedented advantages in the way of combination for all kinds of social and industrial purposes, do not seem to have done much to make men better or happier. This experience seems to be breeding a disposition to get back to the old paths.

If matters keep the turn they have taken now, we shall hear less and less of secular education and its imaginary advantages, which are really serious evils. In wise hands the future of the voluntary schools is assured. But wise handling is more than ever necessary. Religious education is generally demanded, and it is only a question of time before it will be seen that such education must be denominational. The "moral monster" cannot long survive. When that position is reached the problem of "rate aid" will be ripe for solution. The injustice of compelling people to pay for a sham religious education, practically valueless, will be removed when it is appreciated. But that is hardly yet. Meantime the friends of religious education and of voluntary schools should be content with making their protest; and not push forward hasty schemes for remedying the evil, which may afterwards be stumbling-blocks in the way of a more perfect adjustment.

It is the same with State control. The relations of the State and the schools are still in their elementary stage. The whole field, for instance, of secondary education lies practically outside them. The private and the public secondary schoolmaster alike enjoy a bad eminence of independence. Both in secular and religious education our upper and middle classes are neglected; their children may be taught or not, well or ill, just as the parents and the masters and mistresses please, not forgetting the children themselves, who, in many cases, may learn or not, just as they choose. This cannot go on for ever. Some system of State superintendence must be inaugurated sooner or later. And when the relations between State and schools are being adjusted, the voluntary schools must, and will, come in. Until that happens it is no use to make a fuss. The principle must be admitted, but the details may be left to time.

The thing to do is to keep up the triumphant justification of the voluntary schools by the appeal to facts; to take advantage of the flood without wasting strength by getting out the oars, which cannot, at the present stage, assist progress. Perhaps the best motto for the friends of voluntary schools in 1895 is—

"Learn to labour, and to wait."

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Watchfulness. "And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch" (Mark xiii. 37). Introduction.—Our Lord Jesus Christ is here telling in solemn language the terrible events which would take place regarding the Temple and His coming to judgment. He gives plenty of solemn injunctions and warnings regarding these things, of what would necessarily happen, of false prophets, and even false Christs, and other matters of the profoundest consideration. How important it is that we go to the words of the great Teacher and the plain interpretation of Holy Scripture, that our minds may be definitely settled regarding the solemn statements herein given to us for our guidance. How much better and more reliable than the theoretical speculations of modern philosophy and science, so called, which is opposed to Revelation. Let us, then, take the words of Christ, our greatest Teacher, who spake to us as never man spake. Let us lean more than we do on the plain statements of Holy Scripture touching the close of this dispensation, and also the unmistakable salvation which Christ has made for the human race. May we apply a few lessons from our text:—1. The Speaker, He it is that speaks, whose authority is unquestionable. 2. The Speaker, what He says to you personally, to all. How important that each give heed when One of authority makes a statement. 3. The imperative command and duty, "Watch." Be ready waiting, oil burning brightly; instantly obey the call, ready to welcome the Master, not taken by surprise, come what may. Ah, this is the key of watchfulness, ready to meet Christ.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE See of Hereford has not been long without a Bishop, but vacancies have been filled so quickly of late that a nomination to this one was almost expected by this time. Thus far, however, no successor to Dr. Atley has been appointed, and very little speculation has been current on the subject. A more brilliant Bishop than the deceased prelate can easily be found, but not one better qualified for his work, or more diligent in the doing of it.

We are very glad to see that the Church papers which have advocated rate aid for voluntary schools acknowledge the necessity of accepting the report of the Archbishops' Committee. The *Guardian's* remarks are excellent. It says :—"We are not likely to get a better scheme than the one which has now been put forward by all the members of the Committee, and we appeal to those, who like ourselves, have suggested other plans, to lay them aside as cheerfully as they can, and to do their best to unite Churchmen in support of the proposals of the Archbishops' Committee." The *Record* says :—"We look to the promoters of the rate aid scheme to announce its withdrawal in favour of the Committee's suggestion. In the meantime, if our schools are to live until relief comes in such a way, more aid must be derived from subscriptions. Our opportunity may be with us soon, and not a school must be dropped which the fair efforts of Churchmen can save."

The *Church Times* is more critical of the report. It especially doubts, as we think Churchmen generally will doubt, when they come to think the matter over, the expediency of vesting the appointment of teachers in the Education Department. But the present duty is clear :—"At any cost Church schools must be maintained. Churchmen ought not to spend a single penny on organs, stained windows, vestments, or other luxuries, until the whole of our schools are placed upon a firm footing, and beyond the reach of each and every adverse influence."

It is satisfactory to hear that the Church Patronage Bill will again be introduced in the coming Session, and pushed energetically forward. It is said that in consequence of representation from various bodies of Patronage Trustees, more complete protection will be secured to them than was provided for in last year's Bill. Others who thought they were hardly dealt with will also, it is said, find that they have not been forgotten. The *Church Times* trusts that under these circumstances the Bill will have the whole strength of Church feeling behind it, and that the opposition, direct or indirect, will be confined to Liberationist obstructionists. Like sentiments are, we are glad to see, expressed in other quarters.

It is early to talk of this year's Church Congress, which is to be held at Norwich. There are already, however, prospects of a successful gathering. At a preliminary meeting held recently under the bishop's presidency, £1,500 was subscribed to the guarantee fund. Bishop Sheepshanks, in his address, said he was desirous that this should not be looked upon so much as a Norwich as an East Anglian Congress. If the clergy would take an interest in the matter, he had no doubt that a great number of the eminent men who would attend the Congress would be able to go as deputations to various towns of East Anglia and stir up Church feeling. It was especially to be wished that the Congress should be utilised to exhibit the beneficent influence of the Church towards the working classes.

The Bishop of London has, it is stated, threatened to withdraw the licence of a clergyman attached to a proprietary chapel who taught the invocation of saints and the use of the "Ave Maria." The clergyman in question promised, however, conformity to the Bishop's requirements.

There is a persistent rumour, according to a Liverpool correspondent, that the Rector of Liverpool, the Rev. A. Stewart, is about to resign. The Parish Councils Bill has upset the parish finances a good deal. Under the old vestry, of which the Rector was chairman, a voluntary rate was collected with the usual rates. This has been stopped under the new *regime*. The parish peal of bells ceased to ring after December 31st, as the wardens had no funds to pay the bell-ringers. The curates' stipends were also paid out of this voluntary rate. The Rector is an old man, and thinks the new order of things in the parish demands the energy of a younger man. The appointment of a successor will (the correspondent states) lie with Mr. Gladstone.

Not long ago Dr. Clifford invited Mrs. Besant to address his congregation in Westbourne Park Chapel. We do not hear that the Bishop of Auckland requested the lady to preach in his cathedral during her late visit to New Zealand, but, according to a colonial correspondent, he received her into his house as his guest. This seems to be a too literal fulfilment of the scriptural precept about entertaining strangers, and we are not surprised to read that the Bishop's action "has grieved many Christians, and been a stumbling-block to others."

The *Revue Internationale*, the old Catholic organ for promoting the reunion of Christendom, contains in its current number an article in favour of the validity of Anglican Orders, written jointly by the Old Catholic Bishop Reinkens and Professor Friederich, of Munich, Dr. Döllinger's trusted friend. It is in reply to the unfavourable report presented to the Old Catholic Congress at Rotterdam last year by the Dutch Old Catholics. The anti-Anglican feeling manifested on this occasion was attributed at the time, and doubtless with justice, to the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht, who, like his co-religionists generally, is loth to abandon the Pope, and is in but very imperfect sympathy with the Old Catholics of Germany and Switzerland.

We are indebted to the American correspondent of the *Rock* for the following instructive story :—A class of thirty-four young men was recently examined in one of our colleges on their general knowledge of Biblical history, Scripture characters, and Biblical literature. Twenty-two passages were taken from Tennyson's poems, all of which had some Scriptural allusion, and the test was how far each young man understood and could explain the reference. Thirty-two out of the thirty-four were utterly ignorant of Hesekiah's prayer for lengthening of his days and of the turning back of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz. The poet's allusions to "Pharaoh's darkness," to Jonah's gourd, to the striking of the rock, to the wrestling of Jacob and the Angel, to "Arimathean Joseph," to the mark of Cain, were inexplicable riddles to most of the thirty four. Twenty-seven failed utterly in the attempt to explain "a whole Peter's sheet ; twenty-four knew nothing of Jephthah's vow. This (the writer adds) is the result of a system of public school instruction from which religious teaching and Bible lessons are excluded.

A NOTE ON THE TEMPTATIONS OF OUR LORD.

THE following is the impression left on my mind after reading Mr. Latham's book, "Pastor Pastorum," so full of interesting remarks, viz.: the temptations of Jesus, and of us all, are mental.

Heb. iv. 15: "Was in all points tempted like as we are." Our Lord, in His mercy, having taken our nature upon Himself, was tempted *exactly* as a man.

It may be well, first of all, to define what is meant by "person," as referring to God, devil, or man. God is a Person, that is, of perfect and unlimited intelligence. God created everything for His own pleasure; whatever He endowed with intelligence was a person in a limited degree to Himself. God is the great I AM. "I think (Descartes) therefore I am;" but how little is our intelligence when it is so difficult to express thoughts aright. The intelligence of an archangel, man, or devil is but the reflection, in its degree, of the intelligence of God. The archangel is more powerful than the devil, as the devil was unable to snatch the body of Moses from him. The archangel is more powerful, because by his obedience he is close to God, and we in Christ Jesus are more powerful than Satan, and ought to be confident of victory under the Captain of our salvation, against personal devils, who, save in one point, are disunited and disconnected, and whose only bond in common is the desire for the destruction of man; but their power is rendered less powerful by each devil working separately. Satan is a spirit; he is not a God omnipotent and omniscient, he cannot incarnate himself, and it is to be doubted if he could be incarnated. He can in his devilry transform his darkness into light, and this is fearful enough.

The Incarnation having been arranged before all worlds, none but God could incarnate Himself. Milton describes Satan in such words, that he is clothed in a sort of humanity, and artists always paint the devil in human form, and so have led us to view the scenes of the Temptation, as if Satan came before our Lord in a somewhat equal personal bodily condition, Satan seeming to say, "You are a man; I will meet you as a man." So, without thinking much upon the subject, we accept the impression that it was a sort of David and Goliath combat, but it is not exact. David fought alone, and the armies of Israel looked on; but in this case we have to take our part in the battle, and therefore we ought not to think of the temptations as more miraculous than they were; we have to fight against Satan on our part.

Like ourselves, our Lord, by His Incarnation, had Body, Soul, and Spirit. Exactly as the first Adam had been attacked and failed, so must the second Adam be assailed, and conquer. Through the lust of the flesh (food), through the lust of the eye (the kingdoms of the world), and the pride of life (the worship of men), each of these must be separately attacked. But the body about which we know something has been so enlarged upon by artists and sermon-writers, that the soul and spirit are lost sight of. These three suffered on the Cross, and the majority of sermons on the subject dwell so much on the carnal details with such minute exactness, that we forget the high spirituality of the event, and that Jesus by His Humanity unites us to the Father. He is with us as Man in His body—Jesus as the perfect Human Soul and the Spirit uniting us. Body, Soul, and Spirit—Three in One.

Now the first Temptation is so natural to conceive for a hungry man, that the humanity of the whole affair obscures the spirituality.

See, then, that Jesus was tempted exactly as we are. So let us, for a moment, look upon an event of His early days. He went to Jerusalem at twelve years of age, when evidently the Divine Nature (the soul) wrestled with the carnal (the body), and this conflict impelled Him to be about His Father's business before the time, and on being found by His parents, His obedience returns to Him—not that He had been disobedient—and He submits Himself to His parents till thirty years of age. The time comes when, with others, He waits upon the preaching of John the Baptist, and then He hears a description of Himself as a power greater than John. He is hereby reminded, as a man, that the time has now come for Him to enter upon His work. He then places Himself before the Baptist, who, astonished, asks, "Comest Thou to me?" An argument follows, explanations and reasons are given, and John submits, and the heavens are opened, and the Spirit of God descended. As at our baptism a measure of grace is given us, so, too, to Jesus at His circumcision; and at our confirmation more grace is given to us, so now to Jesus at His baptism by John. He had, as we have, to grow in grace (Luke i. 80; ii. 40-52). And as in the case of Saul, afterwards Paul, we see a preparation for the ministry is necessary, after his conversion he was sent to Ananias, and then into the desert of Arabia for study, so Jesus, in a mysterious way, is driven by the Spirit, and in the wilderness He passes forty days and nights in subduing the flesh, disciplining the soul, and strengthening the spirit. Satan is not allowed by God to attack our Lord until permission is given; as shown in the case of Job, Satan can do nothing without leave (Lord, suffer us not to be tempted!).

Is not this the same with us (Ps. iv. 4; Matt. vi. 6) when we are forced to our chambers and compelled to commune with our own heart? for it is through the thoughts, in the solitude of the chamber, in the fields, or in the study, that plans are formed and carried out afterwards. The temptations of our Lord were mental. There was no personal bodily, visible combat with the evil one; we need not think of Satan coming before Jesus, with cloven feet and half-expanded clawy wings—the impression of childhood. Nor need we suppose that Jesus was not assailed till after forty days, but rather think of these special temptations occupying the time.

Now we may easily think and believe that Satan, being a person of limited intelligence, did not understand the full nature of the Incarnation, and thought that he was only battling against an ordinary man, rather than the Incarnate God; and thus Satan challenges our Lord to turn stones into bread, then takes Him to the summit of the mountain in a moment of time, and to the pinnacle of the Temple, on which no two could stand—if all this be read literally, it is literally impossible to agree with the humanity our Lord assumed. Since the Lord was tempted exactly as we are, the actions must be mental.

When the dove descended upon our Lord, the devil then knew for certain that Jesus was the Man. Till then He had been to him but as an ordinary mortal, and he follows Him to the wilderness; he will watch Him. He sees that He is fasting and praying; hunger will soon do its work, it will be easy to attack Him as soon as the pangs of hunger have got hold of Him. Then Satan enters into the human soul and prompts

the man to hold converse with himself: "To what purpose is this long fast? What is the meaning of it all? Am I to be left to die of starvation?" Then in the weakness of the body the eye sees the rounded stones, and He resumes the chain of His thoughts: "I created the world, by a word I made it. I have only to speak and bread will be made; but I have laid aside My glory, I have condescended to be incarnated for a special purpose. I will not yield to the wish of that body which I have assumed; I will resist the temptation. Get thee behind me, Satan! It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every *Word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Satan then began to understand against whom he was contending; he saw by the Word he was contending with more than a man, as afterwards the Jews knew what Jesus meant when He said, "Before Abraham was, I am." Humanity was not allowed to displace the Soul.

Satan's mind is opened, but still he is not clear. The soul—the human soul—must now be the point. The carnal temptation has failed; the fast continuing, the body is still sinking through weakness. The soul too becomes enfeebled, and Satan displays in dreamland the world; so in the delirium of the mind Satan prompts thoughts by suggestions now: "You are a King, and a conquering King! but you know that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. You have been incarnated, and therefore you cannot return. You have undertaken a great work; I honour you for it (laying in this manner a flattering unction to the soul). But all these kingdoms belong to me. I will hand them all over to you if you will only acknowledge that I have the right to them. Show me this honour before my angels. I will repay you amply; I will give them all at once to you, for I have a right to do what I like with my own."

The reply, "Your own?" The thought answer of the mind: "I created the world. I am here for the very purpose of redeeming the kingdoms of the world from you. . . . Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." Jesus here asserts Himself as Lord and Satan's God, and demands his obedience. Satan now understands that he is fighting against God. Our Lord is driving Satan back. (May Isaiah xxix. 8 be applicable)

There remains a further trial, and Satan assumes a moderate, patronising way, for weakness and long fasting have taken the poor body beyond dreamland, and weakness is urging it into spiritual ecstasy. Visions float around Him, and He is carried in a vision to the pinnacle of the Temple, and beholds, the dome being opened as He looks down, the service going on, with all its ritual of splendid ceremonial, possibly one of the three great festivals. He looks down upon the sacrificing priests and their attendants, typifying His coming among them to a wondering and expecting multitude of worshippers. Then the thought is suggested by Satan, "See, your people are awaiting you; you have only to descend and appear in the midst of them, and they will welcome you at once, and your work will be accomplished. Do not think that you will be killed. I am not suggesting self-injury, still less self-destruction. I have been completely beaten. I now know that you are the Son of God, but I am only showing you how easily your work will be done; and besides, see all around; your angels are watching you; they are ready to wait upon you, for it is written, 'He shall give His angels charge concerning Thee.'"

Thus Satan attacks the Spirit. But he is calmly dismissed, and in the simplest possible way: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." There is no argument as about the bread or the kingdoms.

Is there not a confirmation for this view of the mental ecstasy of our Lord in what we have known amongst ourselves? It has not been my misfortune to visit any one in an attack of delirium tremens, but the descriptions of the disease are fearful enough—the sufferer haunted by fearful devils, the phantoms of his diseased brain. On the other hand, it has been my pleasure to know of one who in her last illness said, "Angels visited me and told me that, if I was faithful unto death, I should have a crown of life." She had been much pressed to forsake the Church of her fathers. And of another: "Who is that in white at the foot of the bed? Do you not see him? It is the angel waiting for me." These are delightful ecstasies, the visions of happy minds.

Then the Tempter leaveth Him, and it is my belief Satan never again attacked our Lord with the same directness. When Peter said, "That be far from Thee," he was acting as an agent for Satan. So, again, when Judas betrayed our Lord with a kiss. Temptations come, when direct from Satan, through the mind. Out of the heart are the issues of life; the thought must come before the word or the deed.

In St. John xix. 2, when coming out of the judgment-hall, have we not a remarkable concluding answer to the temptations of our Lord? In wearing the crown of thorns, Jesus removed the curse of the earth, of which the Body was formed. In wearing the purple robe we have the acknowledgment of His subduing the kingdoms of the world to His feet. "The Lord (the Soul) omnipotent reigneth;" and in the testimony of Pilate to the sinlessness of Christ's life we have the worship due to Jesus (the Spirit), though most unconsciously paid.

May our *Bodies* be made perfect, that in them we may praise God the Father; our *Souls* purified, that we may glorify the Lamb who redeemed us; and our *Spirits* united with His Spirit, that our sanctification may be complete. Amen.

C. J. W.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." January, 1895. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." January, 1895. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

"THE FOUR GOSPELS, FROM THE SYRIAC OF THE SINAITIC PALIMPSEST." By Agnes Smith Lewis, M.R.A.S. London: Macmillan & Co.

PROBABLY all who have been reading the last of the three books above named will be quite in agreement as to the immense interest as well as the extreme value of Mrs. Lewis's "find." And we expected articles thereon both in the *Expositor* and the *Expository Times*, and have not been disappointed. Both Archdeacon Farrar, in the *Expositor*, and Dr. Gwilliam, in the *Expository Times*, have much to say that is valuable; the latter gives an interesting account of earlier Syriac MSS. Archdeacon Farrar is somewhat alarmist as to the effect of the readings, which seem to be against the Church doctrine of the Incarnation. We shall hope to show that this alarm is needless.

But there is one thing, amongst many of great interest, which we think has not been sufficiently noticed by Dr. Gwilliam or by Archdeacon Farrar, or even by Mrs. Lewis, and to which we should like to draw attention, viz., the way in which *Sin* (so the MS. seems to be already called) increases the value of Codex D. We would like to draw attention to the following taken from St. Matthew only :—

i. 16. *Sin.* "Joseph to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin." D. lat.: "Cui desponsata Virgo Maria peperit." Similarly Syr.: cu : Arm : but no other uncial.

i. 18. *Sin.* "The birth of the Christ." So (omitting Ἰησοῦ) D. lat. Syr : cu : but no other uncial.

iii. 17. *Sin.* "Thou art my Son." So D. lat., Syr : cu : and no other uncial.

v. 30. *Sin.* omits the verse with D., and no other uncial.

v. 39. *Sin.* omits δεξιὰν. So D. lat., but no other uncial.

ix. 34. *Sin.* omits the verse with D. lat., but no other uncial.

xii. 48. *Sin.* "Who is my brother, or who are," etc. So (ἤ for καὶ) D. lat., and no uncial.

xviii. 29. *Sin.* "I also will pay thee." D. has κἀγω.

xxi. 31. *Sin.* "The last." D. αἴσχατος. But B. has ὕστερος with Syr. : jer.

xxi. 32. *Sin.* "At last repented yourselves." So D. lat., but no other uncial.

xxii. 13. *Sin.* "Seize him by his hands and his feet." So D. lat. and much Patristic support, but no uncial.

xxiii. 10. *Sin.* "Your teacher is the Christ" (omitting one). So D. lat, and no uncial.

xxv. 1. *Sin.* "To meet the bridegroom and bride." So D. and also X^1 (Codex Monacensis).

xxvi. 73. *Sin.* "Thy speech is like." So (ὁμοιάζει) D. lat., but no other uncial.

These are from St. Matthew only, and with one or two exceptions show an extraordinary coincidence between *Sin.* and D. only. Had we named places where *Sin.* agrees with D. and three or four uncials, the list would have been very long.

In St. Matthew only *Sin.* has some very curious readings, *e.g.* :—

iii. 17. "My Son *and* my beloved."

x. 4. "Juda, the son of James."

xxii. 23. "The Sadducees saying to him, There is no life of the dead, and," etc. This reading has some support from the other Syriac MSS.

xxvi. 34. "This night when the cock has not crowed."

xxvii. 5. "And was strangled." 9. Omit Jeremiah. 16. Jesus Bar-Abba. 26. "With whips." 36. "While they were sitting they wrote the crime." 51. "From the very top." 56. "Mary, the daughter of James."

We notice also the continual *Our* Lord, which is somewhat in St. Luke's manner.

Everybody knows of the terrible (?) "She bore him a son." Now the present writer quite admits that on many things he is an alarmist, and says so ; but is there any need for alarm here? The reading is no worse than the οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ of St. Luke ii. 41, and the MS. is evidently the work of a scribe who had no notion of being very exact. "Our Lord" is the language of a *later age;* the scribe wrote it because he *said* it.

But, waiving all this, we can conceive nothing more perilous than making the divinity of Christ hang on MSS. evidence. St. Mark's Gospel, *as a whole*, which contains neither birth nor infancy, is really sufficient, for it is only comprehensible if Christ be the Son of God ; if not, not.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alexander, Rev. C. T., M.A., Vicar of Middleton, Norfolk ; Hon. R.D. Secretary for the Church Army in the Deanery of Lynn, Norfolk.

Alford, Rev. W. P., M.A., Curate at Exmouth; Vicar of Dawlish.

Arkless, Rev. Edward, Curate-in-Charge of St. Aidan's, South Benwell, Newcastle ; Vicar of Earsdon, Newcastle.

Britton, Rev. James Pownall ; Vicar of Lee, Bucks.

Chandler, Rev. A., M.A., Rector of Poplar; Secretary of the National Society for Stepney Deanery.

Chaplin, Rev. R. S. ; Curate-in-Charge of Fontstown, Diocese of Glendalough.

Charlesworth, Rev. Ambrose, M.A., Curate of Eastham ; Hon. R. D. Secretary of the Church Army in the Deanery of Wirral.

Denman-Dean, Rev. Richard, Curate of St. Michael's, Folkestone ; Vicar of Wootton, Berks.

Dixon-Spain, Rev. T. ; Rector of Rand St. Oswald, Wragby, Lincolnshire.

Farmiloe, Rev. W. T., M.A., Curate of St. James's, Westminster ; Secretary of the National Society for the St. James's, Westminster, Deanery.

Gibson, Rev. John George, Vicar of Irchester; Vicar of Hartford, Hunts.

Gould, Rev. R. F., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Kingscliffe ; Vicar of St. Mary's, Peterborough,

Hart-Davies, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Bristol ; Rector of Southam, Rugby.

Hooppell, Rev. J. L. E., Senior Curate of St. Paul's, Lissongrove ; Vicar of St. Peter's, Hoxton-square.

Horsefield, Rev. F. J., Rector of the Albert Memorial Church, Manchester ; Vicar of St. Silas's, Bristol.

James, Rev. A. O., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Leicester ; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for the Deanery of Leicester.

Kelsall, Rev. H. J. ; Rector of Evenlode, Worcestershire.

Kennelly, Rev. W. J. McKeon, B.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Stoke Newington; Railway Chaplain of Parel, Diocese of Bombay.

Neep, Rev. Edward Francis, M.A., Rector of Southam, Rugby; Vicar of St. James's, Bristol.

Preston, Rev. George Herbert, M.A., Curate of Ewell ; Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Fleet, Hants.

Prior, Rev. A. H., M.A., late Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Derby ; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Derby.

Pullibank, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools ; Rector of Rampisham, Dorset.

Wilson, Rev. Thomas Holt, M.A., Rector of Redgrave and Botesdale, and Rural Dean ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Wyatt, Rev. Vitruvius Partridge, M.A., Curate; Minister of St. Leonard's, Bedford.

Wynell-Mayow, Rev. Arthur, M.A. ; Vicar of Dunster, Somersetshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blakeney, Ven. John Edward, D.D., Archdeacon and Vicar of Sheffield, Canon of York, and Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen, at Belmont, Sheffield, on the 12th inst., aged 70.

Boyer, Rev. Robert Buckley, M.A., Incumbent to the Chapel-of-Ease, Wisbech, and late Superintendent to the Missions to Seamen, at Wisbech, on the 12th inst., aged 65.

Chapman, Rev. John, Rector of Milton, near Cambridge, and late Fellow, King's College, on the 11th inst., aged 92.

Collis, Rev. T. W. S., at St. Bartholomew's Vicarage, Brighton, on the 6th inst., aged 59.

Harper, Rev. Hugo Daniel, D.D., Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, at Howes close, Cambridge, on the 8th inst., aged 73.

Jenkyns, Rev. John, Rector of Pentraeth and Llanbedrgoch, and late Rector of Penmachno, at Pentraeth Rectory, on the 13th inst., aged 57.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VOICES OF THE UNIVERSE.

By the BISHOP OF RIPON.

Sermon Preached in St. George's Church, Bloomsbury.

"There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification."— 1 Cor. xiv. 10.

WE have in this verse the statement of the Apostle's view concerning what we may describe as the voices of the universe. He has a very profound conviction that in the multiplicity, and also the discord often, of the voices of the universe there is not lacking some distinct meaning. He declines the idea entirely that what he hears is a mere aggregation of meaningless noises. He says, "There are so many kinds of voices"; but, he says, "I am persuaded that not one of them is defective, not one of them is lacking in signification." It is not true, indeed, that he meant that we could explain them, as, in fact, he distinctly shows that he declines the task of interpreting these various voices; but he is perfectly persuaded that, although these voices often sound enigmatic and discordant in his ears, if he could only get the key to it, every single voice has its meaning. It is as if you stood in a foreign market-place, as many of us must have done, and heard the babel of voices going on below. You are a stranger in the country, and you do not speak their language; but as you watch those eager faces entering into bargain one with another, greeting one another in the open sunshine, you feel that if only you had the key to the language, all these voices would have meaning for you. You may guess at the meaning of some few voices; you can see the faces all lit up with light and affection and kindly greeting one to another, and you may thus follow to a certain degree the sense of what they are saying; but as you listen to all the strange tumult of voices round about you, you say: "This carries no meaning to my ears, but I am not so foolish as therefore to say that it has no meaning." "There are many voices here, and I am certain not one of them is deficient in meaning." That is what the Apostle says, only he is speaking, not about the market-place where human beings might assemble either for getting or bargaining, but he is speaking of all the voices of the great universe round about. He says: "I listen to them all, and I am persuaded that there is not one of them that has not got a distinct meaning."

Now, in that judgment of the Apostle, I think that the great majority of human beings will be ready, on the whole, to concur. All the voices of nature have, at any rate, a charm for us. Unless we are ready to describe ourselves as entirely outside—so to speak—of nature, and sympathy with nature, we shall find that all of us will be ready to acknowledge the charm of Nature's voices. You cannot go out into the fields and listen to the murmur of the insect and the hum of the bee; to the song of the lark over your head, or even the gentle sighing of the wind beneath the trees, without feeling that these voices have a power to soothe, elevate, and to calm; and as you listen to them you admit their charm.

But, if you look, you will see that in the history of your own life, in all probability, there is a distinct tendency on your part to desire to pierce into the hidden meaning of these. When we were children, what effect had these voices upon us? How we delighted in them; how we clapped our hands at the song of the birds; how we loved to go down beside the merry brook, and listen to its tinkle, and felt that there was music, as it were, spoken at our feet. How we loved to ramble by the sea-shore and, with half dread and half delight, to hear the voices as the great waves came tumbling in. But we were liable to other emotions also. When the lightning flashed and the thunder pealed we cowered to our mother's side, dread took possession of our hearts, and thus in our early life we had a sort of feeling that somehow or another these were voices that were speaking to us. We did not attempt, nor did we often give a conscious expression ourselves to the thought that they had a meaning; but the very delight of fascination which they had for us was an evident sign that we felt there was something in them. Oh, how splendid they grew to us, and how delighted we grew with them as life went on!

Then came the youth of life, that delicious pause, if only the young could make use of it, when somehow or another they stand upon that landing place where imagination wakes up. They have left behind them the unreasoning delights of childhood, and ask for the meaning and explanation of these things. Now they are assembled by the water-side, and the fingers of the youth will be put into the leaves of his favourite poem, when he wants some one to be a kind of master-interpreter to lead him into the midst of Nature and explain the purposes of its beautiful sounds. That is the stage of imagination. Here is a step, as it were, beyond the previous stage. Once you took a kind of unreasoning delight, but now you take a general interest, in the face of Nature; in other words, you are going a step forward towards the thought of the Apostle—that these things have some meaning. Nature has a power to wake up

our young intelligence, because it stimulates the questioning feeling; it stimulates us to ask the question, "What do these things mean?" We are not accustomed yet to the whole meaning of life, we have not yet got the strong mind, we have not yet got the well-disciplined reasoning faculties; but our imagination is quick and strong, and we say to Nature, "Disclose to me thy secrets, and what do these voices signify?"

And then, when we get into manhood, when we get the mastery over our reasoning powers, we feel still a strong desire to know the meaning of these things in Nature. Now, we are none the less earnest to discover its actual meaning. When a thing happens we do not pass it by with a childish dread, nor yet with a boyish imagination, attributing thoughts to it which are drawn out of the product of our own feelings, but we say, "What is the significance of this; why did that thing happen?" If we utilise our full reasoning faculties we may, in the spirit of intelligent enquiry, seek to discover what these voices mean. Therefore in the history of our intellectual growth there is a distinct indication that we are pushing on after the Apostle's thought; there is not one of these voices—that is the understood *premiss* of our efforts—there is not one of these voices that has not got a meaning.

And now mark; as is the history of the individual, so also is the history of the world. These voices broke upon the ears of men in early times, and they were in their childish age. How the untutored barbarian in the young life of nations trembled at the voice of thunder; how he attributed to everything some God-like or Divine or mischievous power! He felt there was something in those voices which came to him and by which the gods had their power over him; and as he set up his little fetish, arranged his little methods of worship, as he made his enchantment, he was but just like the child in the nursery, cowering to the side of that which he believes to be his protecting power. And yet what an instinct he has for the voice of Nature; what a wonderful power of forecasting what will happen! His eye is much quicker than yours, his ear is much more capable to catch distant sounds and to interpret them, and to point out in a moment things which you and I would pass by unrecognised. This is because Nature's voices are clear to him, even when they are not clear to us. But by-and-by, when men emerged from the childish condition, they wanted to know more. Then they gathered around the seer or king who might interpret these things to them, and they learned in a sense to bear them in their minds. Imagination is awake in the history of the world, and imagination takes these things—it takes Nature, poetry, and says, "I will explain it"; and then the poet or the prophet become the leaders of such a time, because they are the great interpreters of the voices of Nature round about. And that, again, only shows how true the world's verdict is in accordance with the Apostle's thought—that there is a significance in these, and that the earnest desire, not only of the individual, but of the race, is to wrest, as it were, from Nature the secret meaning of her deeds.

Then comes the later development—the manhood of human beings—and you know how true this is. Then come the other seers of Nature. We are not now dealing with the singer, but we are dealing with the man of science, and the man of science is the interpreter of Nature. This is his function. The moment he abdicates that, he ceases to give anything which the world wants. We ask them, "Tell us the meaning of these things." The keen wit of man will penetrate into the secrets of Nature, asking when the voices speak, What do they mean? When he hears the thunder roar he will know the causes of the explosion; when the earthquake is beneath his feet he will make an investigation—"What is the meaning of this?" All the powers of the later life of mankind are directed still, though in different fashion, to an interpretation of the voices in the world. Now, these faculties, whether the childish, the imaginative, or the scientific power are, all of them, working as it were in the same direction, and they are expressing their belief that though there are so many kinds of voices in the world there is not one of them without signification.

But that does not mean for us any more than it did for the Apostle, that there are not a large number of voices which are as yet uninterpreted. Much has been already explained, but much remains behind; much territory has been conquered, and Nature has revealed to us the significations of many of its voices; but still beyond all these, there are voices which humanity yet asks should be interpreted to it. Still the pale shadow of death waits behind, and we ask what the sepulchral voice of death means. Still we stand by the waves of the sea-shore, and we ask what these roarers mean by their voices. Still in the tumult of the tempest we want to have something explained. There still are the uninterpretable provinces of Nature; but we feel, as the Apostle felt, that though we may be able to pierce so far as to get some answer and some significations from Nature in some departments, so are we perfectly sure that if the key were given to us we should be able to find a significance in them all. We, too, stand as it were upon the great market-place of the world once more. We hear the babble of the voices in this great market of the universe, wherein all the forces of Nature are exchanging their strange merchandise, and are turning heat and light into force and motion. Still are the voices round about us like the clamour of the market-place, and we say, "We have not the key to them all." Some we dimly gaze at; some voices have a meaning to us; but there are so many kinds of voices, and we are persuaded, though some of them are as yet enigmatical to us, yet if only we could get the key, not one of them i

without signification. Such is the Apostle's thought, and so far, I think, you will agree that the general tendency of humanity is to agree with the Apostle.

But now I want you to see that the Apostle wants to go further than that. He was not here to teach us a lesson on what we may call natural philosophy, or the explanation of the phenomena of Nature. He was not simply dealing as a poet might, who takes us down to the river's marge and tells us that the very stream at our feet has a meaning; but rather he is writing to men and women, and he is anxious to arrest men by the thought of this great truth, that there is not a voice which sounds in Nature which is without its signification.

For what follows? This is but dumb Nature. This Nature around us, compared with the voice of man, is after all only a dumb thing. There are no articulate voices around us in Nature; these are but the inarticulate cries of what we call either the animate or the inanimate creation. There rise beyond these men, men with reason, men with power to articulate speech—men capable therefore of expressing the thoughts that are in their hearts, men whose voices are capable not only of a doubtful but of a real signification. Now the Corinthian Churches were all ambitions of great gifts; they delighted to be prominent among the Churches in the possession of various gifts, miracles, prophecies, tongues, what not! and he is most anxious to bring them back to the sober realisation of the significance of things, and to draw them away from the vulgar ambition and the mere display of them. The difference between man and man, he says, lies here—that a man may be ambitious of using his gifts, but after all the using of the gift implies that the gift has some use, and the gift must be used in such a sense as that it conveys a definite idea to man. He says, If you have the gift of prophecy, if you have the gift of tongues, pray that you may interpret them. I want you to be certain of this—that what you utter is something that your brother man can understand. There, he said, I would rather speak five words in the church that would be understood than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. Better, he says, a word of kindly greeting between man and man, than all the most eloquent gibberish under heaven, because this does no good. There are many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification. Nature rolls the thunder over our head; Nature spreads the water beneath our feet, and none of them are without meaning; but, O man! created with a power greater, and an intelligence nobler, than is lodged in the thunder-cloud or in the ocean, remember this—if you believe that these inarticulate voices have signification, know that it is your highest privilege to take of your life and to make it bear true signification and real meaning amongst your brother men. That is what he urges, and therefore he says, "I care not what your gift may be—speech, miracle, power of doing great things, or the power of speaking great things; take care that all these gifts may be brought under the subordination of the intelligence you possess; for the value of a gift lies not in its astonishing men, not in its coercing their admiration, but in its benefiting their lives, in its profiting their understandings. Therefore, he says, remember it is a base thing—almost an ignoble thing—for a being who belongs to the higher order of creation to be speaking, and speaking into the ear, and that those who listen should not then be able to say at the close of your giving of thanks, "Amen." For all human effort ought to awake the loud "Amen" of a true responsive intelligence; and every effort of ours is a lost effort, every exertion of ours is a wasted exertion, if it does not bring forth a strong "Amen" from some human heart.

What follows? Is it not true that just as there are so many kinds of voices in Nature which, indeed, may have a meaning, but which meaning I cannot understand, so also is it with regard to poor human life? There are lives that are meaningless to us, and there are lives that are full of meaning. What is this life? Oh, how gay and pleasant he is, so full of all that ready *bonhomie*, to meet you with such grace and kindliness! And as you watch him you say, "There is a career before that young man; he has such grace and such readiness of manner; he, by his very graciousness of disposition, paves the way to success, and his friendliness of manner makes every one his friend." He is invited out to many a drawing-room, he is just the one that is sought after; give him a place there, for he is always pleasant! But what has come of his life? Read it! At threescore years and ten he is the old dandy of the drawing-room still, and he dandles his eye-glass in the old fashion of his youthful days, and people bear with him with a quiet smile of patient derision, and say, "What has he done? He is a very nice fellow, but no more." There are many kinds of voices in human life, but are there not some of them that are contemptibly insignificant, directed to no purpose—the flotsam and jetsam of life, mere driftwood on the great ocean of life, welcomed here and there, doing nothing, achieving nothing? That is the kind of life.

There are lives, but you need not go into the gay drawing-rooms to find them. You may find them in more prosaic places still. Yes; he got such a good appointment when he was young, and he was looked to as one who was certain to rise. Had he not such a good address and way with him? Business would follow such a young man as that! But somehow or another you watch the other clerks in the office, and one by one they push by him, because his heart never was in the business. The moment the clock struck and the door of the office was closed, away he was on anything

except his business. And there he is in the City still, lean, cadaverous, starved—leading a pointless existence, and you say what a shame that he should be left to be in a subordinate position at such an age! No—no, but wait a moment. Had his life been capable of expressing itself in any articulate form, he had not been there; but he is one of the inarticulate beings, and therefore he remains where he is. If he had only shown purpose, and if he had only spoken out in an intelligible voice, men would have listened, and he would have been a man amongst men; and now what is he? He is merely a thing; he is an appendage of the institution or the office of which he is a member.

Why, yes, there are such things, alas! as useless lives, insignificant lives. Yes, how happy you can be; how joyous, because upon you there come no cares. It is for men to go out into the world and toil, but you in your girlhood feel, "I have no such sense of responsibility as this, thank God, and can just enjoy myself!" And so enjoyment is followed by this—the slow deterioration of all the powers. There is no study, and the intellect has grown barren. There is no exertion for the sake of others, and the heart gradually becomes selfish, enclosed. There is no effort of will against the mere love of pleasure, and so the character never achieves its own dignified self-possession. Or you may marry, and you may bear children; but even in your motherhood, your life will be a mere insignificant thing, for over the cradle the listlessness of your pleasure-loving disposition will be there, and you will not transmit, either by blood or example, to your offspring a nobler conception of life, as that a human being should not be sent into the world and pass from it without speaking some articulate message to his fellows.

And if there are these inarticulate lives, remember there are lives that speak out with strong and clear meaning. St. Paul says, "I had rather speak five words with my own understanding, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." Watch him, the old Sage of the past, going through the streets of Athens! See how he pauses before man after man! See how his words are few, but his questions are searching! See how he probes into the interior of their understanding, and makes the man undisclose the true basis of his thought. See how he makes the man question himself by being the suggestor of keen and powerful questions. Why, this man who speaks but little, who leaves nothing of his own on record, has yet a voice; and Socrates spelt out to the world at any rate some word, and that word was "Truth." In this life there are some men, and their lives are only like letters scattered down by an infant hand, spelling out nothing. Other lives spell out something as Socrates spelt "Truth."

And again; why, see those lives of which I speak, the inarticulate lives, only like the notes of the piano struck by some infant hand, without cohesion, harmony, beauty, or expression—only an annoyance to those who have a sense of music at all. How different with some of the voices that come and speak to us, majestic as the anthems of the sea—a voice like Milton's, strong in song, strong also to be on the side of what he believed to be the true; capable also of holding to his principles and rebuking even his own adherents when he felt that they had gone beyond true principle. "Thou hadst a voice"—that will be the eulogy of such a man as that—"a voice majestic like the sea;" not a voice that spoke only in his sonorous prose, or in his magnificent verse, but in the dignity and coherence of his life there was the majesty of his voice! These men spelt out something—some song that sang for humanity.

And then there are others to whom we look—those who sound the trumpet for us in this great war. Do not think it is an ignoble conception! Life is a warfare for the most of us, and the man is wise who says, "While I am in this world I stand at arms watching, for who knows when the foe may come!" Such a man's conscience and will and intelligence are always listening to hear if there be any note which sounds an alarm; ready to gird on his armour, ready to confront the foe! Yet, alas! what strange sounds are these, the doubtful, hesitating notes blown from the trumpet which seems to be placed to the lips of one who has as yet no conception of what the order is that he has to give. Others there are who take the trumpet from the hands of men and blow a blast, and the world rises up and says, "It is a call to war. What are we to do? Show us, and we follow!" And here to-day you and I know, speaking on this which is the memorial Sabbath of one great name amongst us, that just so was his voice the trumpet voice of God into our ears. Take him as you please, this was the significance of his life, its great coherence; its power of speaking out one thing, that men might feel that at least there was one amongst them to whom God was king and to whom life was duty.

But if, then, we find these varieties of voices, notes which stir us up, lives which somehow have no influence over us, and other lives which, like martial music, rouse all our noble ardours and make us ready to take the field—what is the secret which makes the difference? What is the cause which makes one life so full to us, while another has no meaning? What is that constitutes the articulateness or the inarticulateness, the significance or the insignificance, of human lives? One very simple thing—coherence, that is all. The reason why these letters spell something, is because they cohere together according to a certain law, and express something. The reason why these notes are sweet and inspiring to your ear is because they blend together according to the codes

of harmony. And so are human lives bound together by something which brings coherence and signification, harmony and force. And, if you recollect, that is just exactly what happens. Look at the lives which strike us; look at the imperious and imperial personalities amongst us. See the great man so much before us during the last few days. What makes Bismarck such as he is? Coherence—one purpose! Criticise as you please, there can be no question of the greatness which testifies, "I have a purpose; I will weld the empire into one, and I will make Germany great. Everything shall be diverted to that end." That is coherence. The difference between a life which is full of meaning and a life which is insignificant lies precisely in the word "coherence." Why was Newton great? Why, because Newton, like all great men, said, "This one thing I do," and he forgot his food in the earnest contemplation and pursuit of science. It is coherence which makes greatness in life.

"Ah," but you say, "that is exactly what we know. It is well to talk of these things and to give us these great names, but what of us? We have not gifts like these; we are not Newtons nor Bismarcks; we cannot climb to the heights of science, nor can we dive into the deep places of politics." Ah, but pardon me, are we not forgetting the Apostle's principle? It is not ten thousand words of an incoherent life which make a grand and eloquent passage in the history of a nation, but it is even but five words which are coherent, and therefore are greater than the ten thousand words in an unknown and, therefore, an unsignifying tongue. And so the Apostle gives us the key to it all. Your life and mine; why, I care not in what circumstances they may be placed—that is not the question. Coherence does not depend upon the number of letters which are given to you, but upon your power to blend them into something significant. It is not the whole alphabet which is given to every one of which to make some noble verse. No; you are given your few letters, and the skill of your life is that it shall express something, and something sweet, and so your notes shall be manifold. Maybe the instrument which is put into your hand is only one; you are not given, perhaps, to preside over the orchestra of the world, and to send forth the majestic sounds of some great oratorio like life; but you are given an exercise, with some few notes, and it is for you to work it out so that the exercise shall be sweet and significant. Make your lives coherent, and your lives will be great. Let your lives be incoherent, and with no power to interest in them, with no working out of any solitary single purpose, and then as they are incoherent, so are they insignificant; and for human beings, possessed of will and thought, to be insignificant in life is to be contemptible also.

What is the key the Apostle gives us? Why, it is at the very head of the chapter. He starts the chapter by saying, "Follow after charity." There is the key of the coherence of any life, however small or however great. Oh, it is not your power of prophecy, you great men of genius! it is not your power of wonder-working, you man of action in the midst of this world! it is not your power of startling people into admiration by reason of your strong gifts! These are not the things, for yonder in God's heaven it is God's to listen, not for those strange voices which provoke human admiration, but for the simple voices that express in simple lives one single thought of love. If you will only take the passion of love and "follow after charity" and bring that in as the measuring force, the guiding force, the instilling power of your life, whatever else you may fail to do, you will not fail of making your life a truly significant one. I do not mean that the world will hear of you—do not mistake me—but what I do mean is, that where you have been, and what you have done amongst the few to whom God sent you, will not have been insignificant.

Ah, "follow after charity." Who may gather its power! The simplest things are the strongest; the most commonplace things are the greatest after all. The bonds of your home lie not in the greatness of the calling of the man who goes forth to business, but they lie in the simple affection which is lodged there—in the home love. The simplest things, the common-place things, are the mighty things of life. "Follow after charity"; cultivate it, make your lives under the guidance of that fertile love. Spell out day by day the five words of the meekness, the gentleness, the purity, the righteousness the love of Christ, and you will bring into your life that which, at the close, will make it not an unworthy one—an inarticulate life, but a life which has God's meaning in it.

And then you will say, "Yes; whence this power? The commonplace is often the most unattainable." True; but there was One Life that was very short for ministerial purposes—but three and a-half short years, and yet that life spelt out to human kind God's love, and whatever else men have forgotten, they never will, since that life has been lived, forget that love has triumphed where all other powers have failed. And that life which, remember, is the guardian life of the Christian Church; that life which is the exemplar life of every Christian man and woman; that life which also can be yours because His Spirit that shed abroad the Divine will be an inspiring life to you—is a life accessible to all men. And the revelation and the inspiration which is in Christ is surely linked up there in the thought, Follow, follow after charity. Pursue it as if it were the one thing you wanted. Take it to your bosoms until that love which He showed is a love which is attributed also to you. Sun yours If in the sunshine of that love, till your heart grows warm, and you, too, will go out with such sunshine in your hearts, such power in your lives, that it will

be impossible for you ever to live an insignificant life; for all men will take knowledge of you, that you are the epistles, living epistles, known and read of all men, because you carry the message of God's undying love throughout the world.

There are many kinds of voices, and so I would ask you at each occasion of your life to deal with your life so as to give it signification. If I might venture the application to-night, I would say remember on each occasion and stage of your life you can give it either significance or insignificance. The significance of your worship here to-night is this one thing—the expression of the reality of your thought, the reality of your purpose, the reality of your sympathy. To go out of God's House and church, and carry with you no sense of the reality of love, is to have missed, so to speak, the signification of our worship. As we lift up our hearts to Him, oh! believe it, His dowry of love comes down to us. Nay, if we would only lift up our eyes, we should find that love enfolds us everywhere. And if this worship becomes significant to you, remember that the outpouring of your sympathetic love will be the readiness to co-operate in every good work, such as that for which your alms are asked to-night. Do not let, in your generosity, your worship be an insignificant thing—that you have joined in prayer and praise and accepted the ministries of this church, and yet feel no sympathy with its toilers and labourers who have their difficulties to meet. Remember, that if you yourself follow after charity, the heart, warmed into consciousness of that, will go out to the world, out to-day in its streets, and out to-morrow and through your life with a message which never will be stayed, because it will be one of the voices of God which cannot be without signification.

THE LIGHT OF LIFE.

By Rev. C. G. LANG, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Magdalen College, and Vicar of St. Mary's Church, Oxford.

Sermon Preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, in connection with the University Extension Meetings.

"Then spake Jesus unto them, saying, I am the light of the world; he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."—John viii. 12.

KNOWLEDGE is a branch of life, a means to a richer and fuller experience of life. That is an elementary thought; nevertheless it is constantly forgotten. Let us try this morning to bring its meaning before ourselves. Life, of course, is not a mere passive existence, the mere unthinking acceptance of routine. The very motive that has brought us here together to study for a time is a desire for emancipation from this unconscious existence into a fuller, freer, and more active experience. Nor on the other hand is life a mere accumulation of these experiences. We know well enough the poverty that comes upon a life which treats the world as mere pastime for its own consumption. It is marked at once by selfishness and superficiality. Life is something not only active and creative. It not only receives but deals with experiences, arranges and moulds them into one whole, not by intellect alone, or sense reception alone, but by the will. Life, that arranging, that moulding, that creative power, is ultimately a matter of the will. And so it is with all education. The bringing in of these experiences into the will to be dealt with by it and arranged into one whole depends upon the set of the will, upon human character.

What is the force which sets the will in motion, which determines and sustains its course? It is this ultimately and nothing else—the force of some central conviction. We get back at the very threshold to the need of some central conviction of the life, some deep thing that a man holds to himself, and holds and acts by as to the meaning of his own life and of his place in the universe, and that is his religion. Religion, let us remind ourselves, is not profession; it is, as Carlyle put it, in words that could not be better said, "A man's religion, be it much, or be it little, is the thing a man practically does lay to heart, and know for certain concerning his vital relations to this mysterious universe, and his duty and destiny there." That is in all cases the primary thing for him, and creatively determines all the rest. Vital education, therefore, that education which is to be the minister of life, is based upon religion, depends upon religion, is sustained by religion, and cannot be separated from it, and does determine therefore the answer which a man gives to these great fundamental questions. "What am I? What is this world? If there is a God, what is my attitude towards Him? Is it so real to me that I will sacrifice something for it?" At the threshold of every course on self-development there meets and confronts us that imperative question, What is that central conviction of life which you are going to carry into our education?

There is a widespread inclination in our time to shirk these questions. It is an inclination which all of us who by our presence here profess ourselves to be Christians share as much as others. It is one of the signs of living in an age of transition, that even when we do not hold views that make against the force of religion, yet we are conscious of the temperament, of the disposition which ultimately issues in that. Let us consider somewhat of these temperaments. I am not speaking to those who do not share the Christian faith; I am speaking to those who have it. It is to them most of all that the need of retaining a central conviction comes home.

First, then, let us consider what we may call the agnostic temperament. I do not mean in

regard to any theory of the universe, or rather a complete and final abandonment of a theory of the universe which goes by that name; but I mean a certain disposition of mind and character which phrases itself in some such way as this: religion is surrounded with great difficulties; probably by what we gather from the conflict of able and good men, no definite position is really tenable. It is best to keep the mind open upon these central questions; and so the character is allowed to drift without any determining arrest, without any moment in which it is brought to face once for all the questions, "What is your life, what is your estimate of God?" Or perhaps religion is associated with narrowness and prejudice. It comes to us laden with tedious and uninspiring memories. We turn eagerly to the new emotions and experiences and freedom of a fuller life, and, without knowing it, we allow our interest in these old questions to slip from us. And so the matter is left with indifference; and we Christians drift along. Obviously that is a position which cannot be final to any honest man; the issues are too fundamental. Is the universe unintelligible, so far as I am concerned? Or is there behind it a Mind, a Will of God, still more a loving God? Obviously upon the answer to these questions depends the character of life. Life must be entirely different in proportion to the answer which we give. And so we dare not, we cannot, be content with a casual *if*. It is a deep responsibility, a very great and heavy responsibility, for any one lightly, thoughtlessly, heedlessly to slip from some belief in which he has been brought up. If it has gone, or if the belief is unreal; if in a moment of uncertainty we stop and ask ourselves precisely, what do I mean by this general profession which I make; if, then, it seems unreal, we must fall back upon the intense desire to arrive at some central conviction. We are not bound, perhaps, to take this or that particular answer. That is in the hands of our Father in heaven; but we are bound to seek for one, and never to rest until we have found it, or our character must sink into moral vacancy. We shall be condemned to failure in reaching the truth from failure in resolve to seek it. Let us remember that mere openness of mind upon critical issues is not a thing in itself meritorious. If it is accepted as an end in itself, it becomes an excuse for moral indolence. Indecision of mind passes into the region of the will, and poverty of central conviction causes paralysis of character. To find, that is in the hand of God. To seek, that is in our hand; and seek we must, at the peril of losing everything that is great in life. So much for the agnostic temperament.

Let us now think for a moment of what we may call the literary temperament. We have come here full of eagerness to read and learn—an eagerness which is matched only by the ease with which it is gratified. We are united in acknowledging the charm that comes from acquiring new knowledge, new experience. But let us remember that there is some particular danger in literary studies. Literature ultimately deals with words, not with things. Consider those pregnant words once spoken from this pulpit by Dr. Newman, "Literature is almost in its essence unreal, for it is the exhibition of thought disjoined from practice." Mere literary education becomes mere acquaintance not with the things themselves, but with the ideas which have been framed, and the phrases that have been used about them; and the mind which contents itself with a mere literary education becomes less the home than the hotel of ideas—a mere drift of opinions which leave nothing behind them but the memory of a number of untested phrases. We must take care lest literary education sows ideas and impressions more quickly than there is the room or the leisure for them to ripen into conviction. Unless we are on our guard we shall find that the native strength of the soil is exhausted, and the character is doomed to sterility. We in Oxford know too well how possible it is to find men who are filled to the full with literary education, but who cannot step forward and act in God's name for the benefit of their kind.

Then, thirdly, there is the sympathetic temperament. One of the most striking results of the spread of education is the spread of the range of sympathy. To read books means that we become familiar with and interested in types of character which once we could not even have understood; and to that aroused sympathy the fiction and the drama of the day make unremitting appeal. Authors, novelists, dramatists vie with one another in presenting before us new and startling types of character. We are taken by surprise; we feel somehow that we must sympathise, yet that we ought not to do so. We have no resource of moral being to fall back upon to steady and control the stream of sympathy. We are apt to be filled with vague sympathies which are contradictory one with another, which are untested by any moral standard, which have no fixed relation to the purpose of life. Here again remember that mere quickness of sympathy and liveliness of emotion have of themselves no merit. They are merely sentimental unless based upon fixed principles. For illustration let me give an instance in which we see how deep sympathy may be original, and yet hold fast to these great principles. One who was a sinner stood before the Son of God, the sinless man, and He said, "Neither do I condemn thee, go in peace." But His words had power to heal and to transform because they came from a will which was faultlessly true to the Divine will of righteousness. We must beware lest the width of our sympathetic sensations shall weaken within us the will for goodness.

Fourthly, there is the philanthropic temperament. Here again we are not so much attached to the theories as infected with a good temperament. I suppose there is scarcely any one in this church who has not somehow or other associated himself or herself with some form of philanthropic activity. Consider the range, the ingenuity, the persistence of philanthropic enterprises around us. Yet there is so little done. Why is it? Is it not because these schemes and plans and purposes, so wise, so ingenious, are but the wood and coal for the burning of evil? They cannot generate their own fire. Where is the fire to come from? It cannot come from a mere socialistic sentiment; it must come from the burning reality of personal faith—from the intense consecration of personal character. The one lesson we have to learn is that mankind must be redeemed from the individual outward, by the reality of personal faith and personal consecration, not from society inwards. The power of doing good depends upon being good. There is no one to whom the words come with deeper meaning and greater force than to the eager philanthropist. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" It is vain to try to work for a tendency for righteousness unless we have within us the true faith. We must, if we are to do good in our day and generation, have within us not only a desire to do good to men, but an intense and anxious quest in our own characters for the holiness of God. Without this illuminated central conviction the will becomes crippled, dormant, and we stumble and stray. At the very outset there is the need of a light of life, the need of some direction and guidance to the will. It is not easy, even when we desire to seek it, earnestly to find it. There is a mass of evil inherited coming upon us in such baffling and unsuspected forms, and with such irresistible powers, that we ask ourselves, Where are the tokens of a moral purpose so sure that we can stake ourselves upon its reality? Religion lives in an atmosphere of apparent contradictions. Is it possible to close the discussion, to shut our ears to everything except belief? Or, greatest difficulty of all, we contrast the vanity of our human hopes and struggles and ideals with the unswerving, unsparing and awful trend of the universe; and it seems as if all that is best and deepest within us only beats in vain against the barrier. How are we to hold to some individual purpose and faith and strength against it? We need the light of life; and just when we are anxious to seek it, there is the greater feeling of darkness. But with firm will and strong purpose that light must be sought. This place, this pulpit, bears witness to men of faith. They made mistakes, they were often ignorant, they were often narrow, but they made for good in the world, they kept the light of moral purpose bright. And why? Because they saw outside themselves, revealing itself, shining in upon them, the Light of Life, which made the whole world luminous with God. Into this distracted world had come One who spoke as never man spoke, who lived as never man lived, who communicated to those who followed Him an experience which made all things new; who led them through that experience, even in darkness, into the conscious presence of God Himself. These men knew the needs of the human spirit, those deep instincts that no doubt can stifle, and no difficulty suppress. In Jesus of Nazareth has been found the Light of Life clear enough to show God and the way to Him. They accepted it; they made that their central conviction. They found it true that "He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the Light of Life." He revealed the purpose of life through the reality of human experience. He revealed the responsibility of life, a struggling with evil so determined that even death must be accepted before surrender. He revealed the fact that the desires of God are implanted within us as tokens of a Fatherly Love so intense in its yearning that it died to win the souls of men. Life became full of light and full of strength when the light of that central conviction dawned upon them—that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that all who believed in Him should have eternal life."

As with them, so it may be with us in our studies. The wish to believe is not a strange emotion, an unwonted intrusion into the domain of the intellect. It is the deepest, strongest, truest thing about us, the one thing so absolutely good that it is worth while to stake everything upon it. There is the central conviction; there is the power that gives stability and courage in the midst of all difficulties and distractions of the mind.

> Jesus is the name exalted
> Over every other name;
> In this Name, when'er assaulted,
> We can put our foes to shame;
> Strength to them who else had halted,
> Eyes to blind, and feet to lame.

Forgive me if at the outset of your course of study I give you nothing but the old, old story of Jesus and His love. In all your learning you will come upon nothing so deep, so true, so worthy of allegiance, so satisfying. At the threshold of your studies make that the central conviction to guide and inspire them. It is no narrowing or cramping allegiance. In Him is the "fulness of God." He is the Eternal Beauty of which all that we can see is but the reflection. He is the Eternal Will. He is the Power for good. Study in His name and for His sake. Gather unto yourselves the full richness of human experience. But let it not stop there to become stagnant and corrupt; pass it out again from yourselves to God as a gift of gratitude. So shall your study be disciplined by service, and your culture be exalted into worship!

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 1895.

EDUCATION AND DISESTABLISHMENT.

THE political speeches which have, of late, surpassed all others in interest have been those of Mr. Balfour, in Manchester. His brilliant summary of the hopelessly destructive tendencies of the present Government has been followed by a most valuable contribution to Church defence, in which he has shown the people of Manchester the complete antagonism of the principle of disendowment to the principle of free education. The speech is full of points, notably the broad definition of education as including every one of the forces which mould the future citizen. At present we have a singularly narrow view of education, which is confined to an affair of standards. Even attempts to convey the idea of patriotism have been discouraged. The object aimed at has been to turn the children into mere receptacles of facts, not always capable of any practical application. This has been sometimes combined with movements in the direction of socialism, such as free feeding, and there the official view of education—a modern adaptation of "Panem et circenses"—ends. The elaborate machinery of the Education Department is solely devoted, as Mr. Balfour puts it, to "enabling schools to earn certain grants; in other words, to comply with the technical requirements of the educational code."

And yet, while even this narrow view of education, which is only indirectly concerned with the moral, and not at all with the spiritual part of man, is deemed valuable enough to be kept up at the public expense, and to be offered, and indeed forced, gratis upon the nation, there is an attack upon the endowments of the Church, which ministers to higher needs, and supplies, or tries to supply, the gaps in so imperfect a system. The Church, as a means of education, is at least as valuable as the school—in the minds of thoughtful people much more valuable; its influence, beginning with the children, operates and gathers force throughout life. Its very *raison d'être* is to make men and women better and wiser. The power of the Church is greater, inasmuch as its object is broader and purer than that of the educational code. A good Christian, whatever more he is, has to begin by being a good citizen. And yet, on the pretext of religious equality, the same men who parade their enthusiasm for education are for depriving the nation of its best educational machinery. Looked at from no other standpoint, disendowment is like depriving Eton and Winchester of their revenues in order to ensure "educational" equality by bringing them down to the level of the board schools.

Mr. Balfour is the first public man to bring these two causes, of primary education and disestablishment, into the same focus; but he will not be the last. He has raised a point which the advocates of disestablishment will have to meet somehow. How little inclined they are to deal with this or any other argument may be gathered from the Premier's remarks at Cardiff upon Welsh Disestablishment. Lord Rosebery, on the eve of a Parliamentary session, enunciating the programme and the principles of his party, confined himself to these two sapient utterances: "An ecclesiastical establishment must rest on the deliberate will of the people, or it rests on nothing." "Surely, if the State gives funds for a certain purpose, it has a right to divert them, if it chooses, to another." If such statements as these are due to ignorance, it is a strange and unedifying thing that a Prime Minister should have taken so little trouble to inform himself upon a subject on which he is about to initiate legislation. But if they spring from perversity, as we think they do, what is to be said about their sincerity and good faith? They are the fullest justification of Mr. Balfour's criticism of the inconsistency, to use no harsher term, of the Radical promoters of disestablishment, who are well described by him as "guilty not only of a crime against religion, not only of a crime against property, but of a crime also against the cause of education." The party of alleged liberality is really the party of narrow iconoclasm; their sham progress is, in fact, nothing but proscription, by which it is sought to smite factions on the common ground of mutual antagonism. The inevitable result is extravagance and inconsistency of every kind. Of this, in the cause of education, Mr. Balfour has plainly convicted them.

An anonymous donor ("W. L. T. R.") has sent the Curates' Augmentation Fund a donation of £300.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE Incorporated Church Building Society held its usual monthly meeting at Dean's yard, on Thursday, the 17th inst., Canon C. F. Norman in the chair. Grants of money were made in aid of the following objects, viz.:—Building new churches at Lower Sheringham, St Peter, near Cromer, £100; Nottingham, St. Bartholomew, £100; and South Tottenham, St. Peter, Middlesex, £150; and towards enlarging or otherwise improving the accommodation in the churches at Colebrooke, St Andrew, near Copplestone, Devon, £25; and Ruckinge, St. Mary Magdalene, near Ashford, Kent, £35. A grant of £50 was also made from the Mission Buildings Fund towards building St. Katharine's Mission Church, Plaistow, Essex. The following grants were also paid for works completed:—Heydon, St. Peter and St. Paul, near Norwich, £25; Bucknell, St. Peter, near Bicester, Oxon, £20; and Southwark, St. Saviour, Surrey £250.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells, speaking at a conference of Church workers at Twerton, Somersetshire, said it seemed to be a sort of settled axiom in England that every Churchman ought to be of the same political colour—that every Churchman must be out-and-out Tory. He saw no reason for that, and if they would have nothing but out-and-out Tories in the Church of England they would have to get rid of him. He saw no reason why he should clothe himself in the blue of Toryism because he was a strong Churchman.

The institution and installation of the Dean-designate of Winchester (Prebendary Stephens) will take place on Monday, the 4th of February. Divine service will be at half-past eleven o'clock.

We are glad to learn from the *Essex County Chronicle* that the Rev. H. T. Armfield, rector of Colne Engaine, has so far improved in health as to be able to take outdoor exercise.

The Bishop of Lichfield has offered the rectory of Wolverhampton, vacant by the death of Prebendary Jeffcock, to the Rev. Alfred Penny, M.A., vicar of Tunstall, who has signified his acceptance of the offer. Mr. Penny (says the *Yorkshire Post*) is best known in the Church as an old and successful Melanesian missionary. He was ordained in 1868, and from 1869 to 1873 held the curacy of Hemel Hempstead, in Hertfordshire. He was then presented to the vicarage of Swindon, but he held the living for only one year, having resolved to go out as a missionary to the Melanesian Islands. Mr. Penny sailed for the Pacific seas in 1875, and with but slight intervals laboured at Norfolk Island until 1888, when he returned home. Upon his return to England he laboured for two years as curate at Stoke-on-Trent under the Bishop of Shrewsbury (Sir Lovelace T. Stamer), and in 1890 he was presented to the vicarage of Tunstall. In a pleasant and interesting work entitled "Ten Years in Melanesia," Mr. Penny has recounted his experiences of missionary work.

It is stated that the Rev. R. F. Crockett, formerly minister of the Congregational Church at Worthing, and subsequently of the Free Episcopal Church in that town, has resigned his pastorate with a view to taking orders in the Church of England.

It was announced in the *London Gazette* of the 18th, on behalf of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, that, in consideration of a benefaction of a piece of land, comprising 2,420 square yards, and of £650, they grant to the vicarage of Kirkdale a capital sum of £750 towards the cost of providing a parsonage.

The Bishop of Wakefield's Commission pointed out the desirability of forming a new parish and erecting a church at Gawthorpe, Ossett. The scheme has lately taken a definite shape, with the result that part of the parish of Holy Trinity and part of Earlsheaton have been provisionally united in the new ecclesiastical district of Gawthorpe and Chickenley-heath, of which the Bishop has appointed the Rev. Joseph Walker, late of Outwood, to take charge. The population of the new district is upwards of 3,000. A site has been given for the erection of a church there, and it is estimated that about £4,000 will be required for the building, in addition to an endowment of at least £150 per annum.

One of the subjects appointed for the next examination of the London Diocesan Church Reading Union, to be held in Passion Week, is "The Churchman's Position with regard to Establishment and Endowment." In illustration of this subject a series of six lectures is to be delivered on successive Mondays at 1.15 p.m. in the Church of St. Michael's, Cornhill. The Bishop of London will begin the course on Monday next, and is to be followed by the Bishop of Bangor, Archdeacon Sinclair, Canon G. F. Browne, Prebendary Harry Jones, and the Rev. T. Moore. Other courses are now being given, or will shortly be given, by the Revs. Clement F. Rogers (Hampton Hill), H. Gee (North Marylebone), A. Boyd-Carpenter (St. John's, Paddington), F. Relton and H. B. Colchester (Westminster), W. Allen Whitworth (Primrose Hill), R. P. Thompson (Marylebone), C. E. Prior (Stepney), H. E. J. Bevan (St. George's, Hanover Square), Daire Craven (Primrose Hill), F. E. Spencer (East India Docks), Berdmore Compton (St. Paul's, Knightsbridge), C. J. Ridgeway (Paddington), and Professor Shuttleworth (Fulham).

The *Rochdale Observer* says that an important letter in regard to the surplus funds arising from the Rochdale vicarage estate has been received from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The Commissioners state that they have done more for Rochdale than for any other place with which they have to deal, and complain about the manner in which glebe land matters have been discussed in the town. They must use the surplus arising from the estate with a view to providing for the spiritual needs of the Church not simply in Rochdale parish but elsewhere, as one of their principal duties must be the management of these funds for the benefit of the poor parishes and dioceses in England:—"Having satisfied the requirements of the Church in Rochdale, the Commissioners now believe it to be their duty to consider the spiritual needs of the diocese of Manchester. They will then be ready to consider what the town council may have to say, and will be even prepared to receive a deputation provided it can first be shown that there are reasonable proposals to discuss. In again asking for an interview, however, they say the council must give better reasons than they have yet submitted, and it must be understood that the Commissioners do not feel themselves called upon to release the corporation from the payment of the rents payable on account of the Packer Street and Church Stile improvements. These rents amount to £359 13s. per annum." At a meeting of the sub-committee the letter from the Commissioners was discussed, but it was resolved to recommend the general purposes committee to submit the whole matter to the town council, suggesting that

the town clerk reply to the effect that whilst the corporation are thankful for the remission of the rent of the park and for other gifts, they are disappointed to find that the Commissioners have not seen their way to remit the rents charged on the Packer estate; and that the corporation hope that in the near future the Commissioners may receive a deputation on this and on some other matters.

Reviews and Notices.

EARTHLY FOOTSTEPS OF THE MAN OF GALILEE." Containing 500 Photographic Views and Descriptions of the Places connected with the Earthly Life of our Lord and His Apostles, from Jerusalem to Rome.

THE first part has a beautiful map of Palestine and an outline harmony of the Gospels and chronological index. The views are both interesting and instructive. The animals and figures give some idea of life in the East at the present time. The letterpress gives a short account of each picture, and refers to the portion in the Bible connected with it. We think this publication cannot fail to be acceptable to all who are interested in Bible study. The price of each number is sixpence.

"ROUND THE WORLD FROM LONDON BRIDGE TO CHARING CROSS VIÂ YOKOHAMA AND CHICAGO." An Album of Pictures from Photographs of the Chief Places of Interest in all Parts of the World. London: George Newnes, Limited.

THIS publication is issued in twelve parts, each part containing twenty-four views of the various cities in the world. The cost of each is only sixpence. The reading accompanying the pictures contains much useful information. We strongly recommend a copy of this work to all our readers; it will be found very acceptable in homes and schools.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE SINAI PALIMPSEST.

SIR,—Your Reviewer, in the PULPIT of 19th January, remarks that this MS. "increases the value of Cod. D." He then gives a list of certain coincidences between the two MSS. The remarks are, no doubt, of interest, but how about the inference? Cod. D. is the latest and least valuable of the uncials, noted for its *lacunæ* and interpolations. "*Sin.*," or the Lewis MS., is plainly heretical, and is now condemned as such. How can the value of a shaky MS. be increased by a heretical text, obviously the outcome of a corrupt tradition, if no worse? The motive of "*Sin.*" being obvious, its coincidency with Cod. D. are more likely than not to throw discredit upon that MS.

The discovery of "*Sin.*" is likely, however, to have a more interesting result. For years past the claims of the Curetonian MS. have been urged against the Peshitto as representing the original Syriac, and even the original Hebrew of St. Matthew, of which the canonical Greek is said to be a translation. Canon Cureton's arguments, as Dr. Scrivener said, convinced nobody but himself, but they have persisted for all that.

"*Sin.*" does much to restore the Peshitto to its original position. Its obvious connection with the Curetonian reduces that MS. much to its own level, and leaves the Peshitto as the true Syriac version, resting upon numerous MSS. of very early date. It is quite obvious that a heretical text cannot be the foundation of a true one, for the true text must precede the false; and it cannot increase the claim to authority of any MS. that it is in agreement with a text which omits the genealogy of St. Matthew and, by a host of other alterations and omissions, whittles down the evidence of the Incarnation.

J. P.

CONFORMITY v. NONCONFORMITY.

SIR,—Charles A. Berry, of Worthing, writes:—"Our contention has always been—and Mr. Gladstone fully endorses it—that Evangelicalism in the English Church has never been, and can never be, so logical, coherent, attractive, and impressive, as it is in the great Nonconforming Churches." Now, this statement appears to me to be quite unsupported by effective argument, and perhaps the writer of it, with a view to the nation's good progress, will kindly give a reason why the great Nonconforming Churches hold a more logical position than our National Church. Because if Mr. Berry's statement is proved to be correct, the sooner the necessary change is made the better, of course, it will be for the nation. For my own part I respectfully differ from Mr. Berry on this point of the Church question, as I believe the law of our nation, as far as leading principle is concerned has done everything possible to bring it in close connection with the one true Church's teaching. For instance, is it not the case with all professing Protestants that they accept the Holy Scriptures as the only right rule of faith? What more, then, can our laws accomplish to secure to the people good Church doctrine than to place these holy writings forward as the leading feature in Church administration? What I argue is, with a view to a people's well-being, that nothing can be more logical than for them to select the best principie for their guidance—and this they have in our National Church's rule of faith—and for them to unite together to put it into practice, and that this is the only way to bring about the reunion of Christendom, I have written these lines in much affection, and, I hope, without partiality, and therefore with the one desire that what is reasonable and and just may be followed, and I hope they will receive publication in your columns.

J. T. DOCKER.

Worthing, December, 1894.

LORD Grimthorpe has forwarded a donation of £100 to the treasurer of the York Poor Benefices Fund.

THE Bishop of Winchester has presented the Rev. Arthur S. Valpy, rector of Holy Trinity and St. Mary's, Guildford, to the vacant stall in Winchester Cathedral with the function attached of Canon Missioner for the diocese. The post was formerly held by Canon Durst, now vicar of Southampton.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, M.P., Chairman of the London School Board, and the Rev. C. J. Ridgway, Vicar of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, have become patrons of the Guild of St. Edmund.

THE Rev. C. N. Gray forwards the following opinions which have been obtained by the E.C.U. :—"*Re* Discretion to Grant Licences for Marriage of Divorced Persons. Questions submitted for the opinion of Sir Richard E. Webster, Q.C., M.P., and Mr. W. Digby Thurnam on behalf of the English Church Union :—*Question.*—1. Whether a Bishop has or has not a discretion as to the issues of licences for marriage of divorced persons, whether the applicant be the innocent or guilty party, whose canonical partner is living. *Opinion.*—1. We are of opinion that the Bishop and all persons entitled by law to issue licences have a discretion as to the issue of such licences for marriage of all persons whether divorced or not. In our view, the marriage licence is a faculty or dispensation by virtue of which marriage may be celebrated without the previous publication of banns. Such licences are of canonical origin, and are recognised and regulated by the statute law, but are in no way rendered imperative. *Question.*—2. Whether an incumbent is bound to accept and act, or whether he is bound to allow another to act on such licence. (*a*) Where the applicant was divorced for his or her fault. (*b*) Where it was otherwise, and generally. *Opinion.*—2. (*a*) Where the former marriage of one of the parties has been dissolved on the ground of his or her adultery, the incumbent cannot be compelled to solemnise the marriage, but he is bound by statute to permit any other minister entitled to officiate in the diocese to perform the marriage service in the church (20 and 21 Vict., c. 85, ss. 57, 58). No penalty is annexed by the statute to the refusal of this permission. Mandamus would be the only means to enforce it. (*b*) In any other case, we are of opinion that the incumbent is bound to accept and act on the licence. ("Argar *v.* Holdsworth," 2 Lee, 515. "Tuckness *v.* Alexander," 2 Dr., 8 Sm., 614).—RICHARD E. WEBSTER, W. DIGBY THURNAM, Temple, December 22nd, 1894.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. T. K., M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, Dorchester; Chaplain of Dorchester Prison.

Armitage, Rev. S. C., Curate of Isleworth; Rector of Todwick, Sheffield.

Best, Rev. John Henry, B.Sc. Lond., Curate of St. Stephen's, Kirkstall; Rector of St. Thomas's Stanningley, Leeds.

Bren, Rev. H. A., M.A., Association Secretary of the C.M.S. for West Yorkshire; Principal of the Diocesan Training College at Cheltenham for Schoolmasters and Schoolmistresses.

Chevassut, Rev. F. G., M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Blackburn; Vicar of St. Leonard's, Langho, Blackburn.

Christie, Rev. B. E.; Incumbent of Middletown, Armagh.

Cluff, Rev. William Charles, Rector of Lower Hardres, Canterbury; General Organising Secretary of the Clergy Orphan Corporation.

Cocks, Rev. Arthur; Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Brighton.

Crowther, Rev. L. H., M.A., Curate of St. John-the-Baptist's, Newtown, Leeds; Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Doncaster.

Cudmore, Rev. R. P.; Rector of Great and Little Wratting Suffolk.

Denning, Rev. John Frederick Charles, M.A.; Vicar of Denford, Berks.

Friederichs, Rev. C. G. Neville, B.A.; Chaplain at Biskra, Algeria, for the winter and spring.

Garner, Rev. W., M.A., Rector of Cronwere; Secretary of the National Society for Narberth Deanery.

Heather, Rev. G. A., Prebendary of Ballysodare; Archdeacon of Achonry.

Johnston, Rev. A. J., B.A., Curate of Tramore; Incumbent of Forkhill, Diocese of Armagh.

Johnston, Rev. Samuel, Incumbent of Ballysodare, Collooney; Prebendary of Ballysodare, Diocese of Achonry.

Johnstone, Rev. D. E., D.C.L., LL.D., Vicar of Lenton, Lincolnshire; Vicar of St. George's, Cullercoats, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Kitto, Rev. John Fenwick, M.A., Vicar of St. Martin's in-the-Fields, Westminster, and Honorary Chaplain; Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Lee, Rev. J. T. N.; Rector of Papworth Everard, St. Ives, Hunts.

M'Cormick, Rev. Prebendary Joseph, D.D., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury, and Honorary Chaplain; Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Neligan, Rev. M. R., M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Westbourne-park; Secretary of the National Society for Paddington Deanery.

Pagden, Rev. George Dermer, M.A.; Rector of Cusop, Herefordshire.

Penny, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of Christ Church, Tunstall; Rector of Wolverhampton.

Quin, Rev. Joseph; Incumbent of Armalong, Diocese of Dromore.

Ratcliffe, Rev. Charles Edward Stuart, M.A., Vicar of Bickenhill, Birmingham; Rector of Downham, Brentwood.

Reeve, Rev. E. H. L., M.A., Rector of Stondon; Secretary of the National Society for Lambourne Deanery.

Russell, Rev. C. F., A.K.C., Vicar of St. George's, Cullercoats, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Vicar of Lenton, Lincolnshire.

Ryland, Rev. R. H., Vicar of King's Walden, Herts; Head Master of Maldon Grammar-school.

Saunders, Rev. H., M.A.; Rector of Peopleton, Pershore.

Sinclair, Rev. C. A., Rector of Monewden, Wickham Market; Honorary Secretary for the A.C.S., Deanery of Loes.

Sladen, Rev. S. B. S.; Trotman Lecturer at All Hallows', Lombard-street.

Smith, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Birmingham; Secretary of the National Society for Birmingham Deanery.

Stokoe, Rev. T. H., D.D., Vicar of St. Michael's, Oxford; Secretary of the National Society for Oxford University.

Talbot, Rev. Edward Stuart, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, and Honorary Chaplain; Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Thicknesse, Rev. F. N., M.A., Rector of Abington; Secretary of the National Society for Haddon Deanery (2nd portion).

Thorp, Rev. Asheleigh, M.A., Curate of St. Mark's, Clerkenwell; Incumbent of Annaghmore, Diocese of Armagh.

Tyacke, Rev. R. T., M.A.; Rector of Meavy, South Devon.

Wansbrough, Rev. H. A., M.A.; Vicar of Walsingham, Parva-cum-Houghton, and Vicar of Walsingham Magna, Norfolk (by dispensation).

Webster, Rev. Francis Scott, M.A., Rector of St. Thomas's, Birmingham; Vicar of Aston-by-Birmingham.

Whitfield, Rev. C. H., M.A.; Vicar of Morton Morrell, Warwick.

Williams, Rev. S., Vicar of Llandegley; Secretary of the National Society for Melineth (Sub Ithon) Deanery.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Conder, Rev. Alfred, LL.D., Rector of Middleton, at Middleton School, Bognor, on the 16th inst., aged 62.

Hansard, Rev. Septimus, at the Rectory, Bethnal-green, on the 19th inst., aged 71.

Hawkins, Rev. Herbert Samuel, M.A., for forty years Rector of Beyton, on the 4th inst., aged 76.

Majendie, Rev. Arthur, Rector of Bisdon and Woodstock, at Woodstock Rectory, on the 15th inst., aged 56.

Malcolm, Rev. Henry, B.A. Cantab., Rector of St. Mary's Church and Canon of St. Ninian's Cathedral, at the Parsonage, Dunblane, N.B., on the 15th inst., aged 86.

Martin, Rev. Robert Marshall, late Vicar of Thorpe, Surrey, at Coombe-lodge, Kingston-hill, on the 14th inst., aged 78.

Podmore, Rev. Thompson, sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, for eight years Head Master of Elstree School, and for seventeen years of Eastbourne College, latterly Rector of Aston-le-Walls, Northants, on the 9th inst.

Wanklyn, Rev. Hibbert, at Deopham Vicarage, Norfolk, on the 11th inst., aged 70.

Ward, Rev. John Meire, Vicar of Clapham, and Rural Dean, at the Vicarage, Clapham, Yorkshire, on the 19th inst., aged 75.

Wayet, Rev. Field Flowers, late Rector of St. Stephen's, Bristol, at Gloucester-gardens, on the 14th inst., aged 72.

The Church of England Pulpit.

LAW AS LEADER TO CHRIST.

By the BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

Sermon Preached in Peterborough Cathedral on Sunday, December 9th, 1894.

"Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness."—Rom. x. 4.

OF the many subjects which Advent opens out to us, there is none, perhaps, which is of more profit to dwell upon than the thought of the mode in which God prepared mankind for the coming of Christ, that so we may, in our own experience, reproduce the various steps in that process, and learn from each one of them what they have to teach ourselves. It is not without reason that the collect for to-day—the collect which reminds us of the meaning of Holy Scripture and of its one basis for our faith and the one source of our assurance—it is not without meaning that that collect occurs in this Advent season. For to learn aright the lesson of Advent calls upon us to take the most comprehensive view of the meaning of Scripture; Scripture as a whole, not some parts of it only, but Scripture as a whole, to comprehend the unity of the New Testament and the Old, to see one Divine purpose running through all things, and to see that that purpose, begun here, has its only termination in the judgment-seat of Christ. And so I would venture on these evenings in which it is my privilege to speak to you to ask you to take for your thoughts the preparation which God vouchsafed for the coming of Christ, and to see what were the various steps of the process by which the fulness of the time in which God sent forth His Son, the fulness of the time was brought about. I need not tell you that the fulness of the time did not exist in external fitness, but it existed in the internal preparation of those who were willing and capable of receiving the full purposes of God when it was made manifest to them. The whole history of the Bible is the history of God's selection of a chosen people who were to know His will. And the same process goes on still, and unless we lay hold of that we cannot understand the world in which we move. The Holy Spirit of God is still selecting here and there the souls that are bidden to Him, here and there the souls that give themselves back to the God who made them, who ask only that they may identify their individual life with the Divine life which runs through the universe. Here and there God is selecting, and the world goes on its way, and it has its changes and its chances, and its fashions and its modes of thought, and sometimes one object is the object of man's aspiration and man's ambition, and sometimes another; but God's purpose goes on steadily, steadily through it all, God the Holy Spirit selecting those who give their lives to God, those who identify themselves with Him. And it was so always; and I would ask you therefore to-night, in the light of that thought, to review the process by which the children of Israel became God's chosen people.

God selected first of all one man, Abraham; selected him and told him that from his seed should spring a nation in whom all nations of the earth should be blessed; selected one man and bade him recognise that selection by cutting himself off from all that hitherto he had held most dear. He was bidden to leave his father's house, bidden to leave his friends and go forth, knowing that God's hand was over him, knowing that God had chosen him, knowing that he was called upon to stand alone. Again the world might go on around him, with all its business, nations with their politics, tribes with their purposes, the course of the world might go on round him; but Abraham knew that he was the inheritor of a Divine destiny, and that to him had come a special call to separate himself from all that the rest of the world held most dear. And so Abraham went forth, and therefore his faith was accounted to him for righteousness. He knew that there was a Divine purpose in the world, and he accepted it, and on the ground of that he cut himself adrift from all else and was content to live alone with God, knowing that God's purposes were to be executed in him, but not understanding them, not even asking to understand them, willing only to submit.

And in the life of Abraham were exhibited those qualities which were to be impressed on all his people. "Look unto the rock from whence ye were hewn and to the hole of the pit from whence ye were digged, look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that begat you." That was the prophet's cry, and that was the meaning of the life of Abraham, the great ancestor of the race, exhibiting that one quality—separation from the world and self-surrender to God. And looking back at him, looking back at that great ancestor, the people that sprang from him, were to understand the meaning of their life, and have set before them in an unmistakable form their destiny, their calling, what they were to pursue, what they were to be. And then when that had been worked out in Abraham and the patriarchs, there came a time when the people who sprang from them were plunged into the depths of misery and suffered from the hand of the oppressor; they were brought low and humbled

first of all that they might rise, and they were raised again to a consciousness of their nation's destiny by a signal deliverance from the land of Egypt, and then they were formed into a people by themselves. Two thoughts—first of all, the sense of misery before, and then the sense that God had delivered them and brought them to a land flowing with milk and honey; poor one minute and rich the next, miserable when left to themselves, happy and prosperous when in God's hands—those were the two great thoughts from which their national life was to spring; and then, fortified by those two thoughts, they were to submit themselves to the discipline of the law. The law was the great training of the people of Israel, the law was their schoolmaster to lead them unto Christ, the law in the words of my text, "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness." And that explains the meaning of the training to which the people were subjected. The law was given to them, in all its severity and all its austerity, the law in all its dignity and grandeur; and they were bidden to submit to it—and that is the meaning of their history, a nation trained by law. And that law, observe it, was all-pervading; it covered the whole of their life—their national life, their social life, their religious life; all was prescribed and regulated for them, they were to live the life of obedience to the law.

But though that is true, in the forefront of that law was set the Ten Commandments, and they gave the meaning to the whole. You may speak of the civil law, the common law of the people of the Hebrews; you may speak of their ceremonial law; but both of these had their meaning in the moral law. They were operative because they set that moral law clearly and definitely before them in the small occurrences of their daily life; the moral law stood in the front, the Ten Commandments first of all, and then those Ten Commandments applied to life in all its various details—that, put shortly, that is the meaning of the law. And see the qualities which it demanded of the people. First of all, with the conception of law came that necessary sense of limitation upon personal desires. The natural man clamours for the world as belonging to him, demands that his conscience should be satisfied that his whims should be complied with, regards himself as the centre of the universe, and that all things must be made to accommodate themselves to him. The necessary step in his progress must be the sense of limitations; nay, not my will, for that is constantly in collision with the will of others; not my will to be worked out, but some superior will; not the will even of the majority, not that which is most convenient to society as a whole—not that; that is only a mechanical arrangement—but some superior law of right and wrong written on the hearts of all men, coming from God, expressing itself in the whole tenor of the universe; self-limitation in obedience to something higher and nobler than self—that is at the bottom of the conception of the moral law. And then that has to be worked out by a constant process of self-control and obedience. The necessity, first of all, of self-limitation clearly appearing, and then that self-limitation worked out by self control in the small acts of life, and that self-control resting upon the basis of ready obedience to precept. That was the next step; and then from the conception of law and from the endeavour to obey law came the knowledge of that great fact of human nature, the fact of sin and the consequent need of redemption. For man might say, "Here is the law; I see it; I recognise its rightness; I know that these are precepts which I ought to obey. There it is. I know I ought to take those precepts into my daily life; I know I ought to work them out in my actions; I know it by my reason and because of the truth of it; I know it and yet I do not do it and I cannot do it; and there is the law in my members warring against the law in my mind"—there at once is the mystery of sin and there is the root of the need for redemption. And so through that law that was given by Moses there came the development of all these feelings, of all this knowledge in the mind of the rough, rude people to whom it was first of all applied; for we entirely misread our Bible, remember, we absolutely misunderstand it, the Old Testament is a closed book to us, and has no message to us, if we do not keep before us the actual rudeness and barbarity of the greater number of those whose doings are recorded there. Do not think of Abraham, of Isaac, or of Jacob, do not think of the people of Israel as being people on the same level as yourselves; they were not so. Infinitely below you in moral sense, infinitely below you in civilisation, infinitely below you in everything that makes life—rough, rude, savage. Not until you know that do you see the exceeding grandeur of the utterances that come from them, not until you appreciate their really low condition of civilisation do you see the grandness and the nobility and the splendour of those who responded to God's call. That the magnificent thoughts which the Old Testament contains should come from such a people, should have been the results of such a time, should have been developed amid such a primitive civilisation—that is a standing and a stupendous miracle. And those rough, rude people were subjected to the discipline of the law; and as we read the records of that discipline, the records do not disguise the fact that the discipline was a failure—that it was a failure on the whole. The highest, the noblest characters that are recorded in Israel's history—they have their grievous faults, they have their serious sins, they have their open and their patent faults; even when their transgressions are not greatly marked, yet their characters strike us at once as being harsh and stern and narrow. They

are not men in themselves to be made our models or to animate our lives, none of them, not even Samuel or Elijah, and marked by many faults that we could point out, falling below the principles which they knew they ought to live up to. Even in them, the noblest and the best, the discipline of the law seems to be continually a failure. And there is no attempt to hide it in the records of Scripture. There is no attempt to disguise that fact. Its failure is plainly put before us as operative in the great events of history. But if we want to know what the discipline was doing, we have not to look in the great events of history, but we have to look to the utterances of individual souls, such, for instance, as the writer of the 119th Psalm. There you have an instance of a will that was being formed under this training of the law, a soul that had submitted itself to discipline, a soul that had penetrated into its inmost meaning, and was struggling desperately to make that meaning its own. "Thy testimonies are dear unto me, more than thousands of gold and silver. Princes have persecuted me, yet I do not forget Thy testimonies." Always running through that Psalm, and running through many others, there is that splendid love and devotion and obedience to God's law, because it is God's, that attempt to penetrate into its very heart and lay hold of it. There are the souls being formed by that discipline; here and there again are souls being selected that they might go on and spread and form a seed plot into which still higher ideas were to fall, and from which still nobler utterances were to be made, but in itself a failure.

And yet the law was the schoolmaster leading on to Christ, leading by its very failure, leading by its incompleteness, leading by the consciousness which it created of its own inability to save, preparing the way for Christ. "Well, this," you will say, "is a historical summary"; but is it not full of lessons to ourselves? We, too, are bidden at this time to turn our eyes to the coming of Jesus. Have we not much to learn from that sense of law which must be a necessary preliminary before we also can see Him? The sense of law, first of all, we must have it—law in our lives, law as a regulating principle, that great moral law which we are not to cast aside, that great moral law which we are never to forget. Is it not easy to forget it? Is religion in itself, that is to say, so absolutely and clearly connected with morality that it has never been divorced? The records of the Christian Church do not show that to have been the case. They are disfigured by many marks of human selfishness, they are disfigured by many wrongful deeds done by those who profess to be God's servants. In God's service the Ten Commandments have many a time been dispensed with, the great principles of righteousness have been cast to one side by those who profess to act in God's name. And is not that a temptation to ourselves? Does nobody feel it—the temptation to substitute ceremonial observances for the moral law? "I go to church often, I go to the Holy Communion even, and that dispenses me from doing some of the obvious duties that I know I ought to do. I have got good intentions, a generally right direction of my heart towards God; will He not take that and save me from doing this troublesome, this disagreeable duty, which my conscience sometimes tells me that I ought to do?" Is not that feeling common? Law, the moral law in all its severity and in all its sternness, that must stand in the first place. Too often nowadays the tendency of religious thought is to dwell so exclusively upon the love of God towards man, of the love of the Lord Jesus Christ towards sinners, that people forget that behind the love of God stands also His justice, behind the tender accents of the Lord Jesus stand also His words of terrible sternness. No sterner words were spoken by any one than came from the mouth of the blessed Lord. And think of the meaning of that passage that was read to-night—"In the day when He shall sit upon the throne of His glory and shall judge all the nations, there will be many who will say, with surprise, 'Lord, when saw we Thee hungry, or athirst, or naked, or in prison, and did not minister unto Thee?' And He will say 'Forasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these ye did it not to Me.'" Is not that just what I mean — a substitution of some outward things for those great inward principles of righteousness which must lie at the bottom of all life?

We cannot grave too deeply upon our hearts the supremacy of the law, the sternness of duty and its splendour, the sincerity of the conscience, the readiness to obey its dictates; all these are a necessary part of the religious character; by obedience to them we will be judged at the last. Does Advent tell us of judgment? We shall be judged according to the law. That law did not pass away, but in Christ Jesus it was fulfilled, its ceremonial obligations, its outward duties, they were fulfilled in Christ, and received a new meaning from Him. But those great moral precepts upon which it was founded, they stand behind Him, still they speak through Him, they are pre-supposed in all that He says; behind the sweetness and the tenderness of Jesus there stands all the dignity of the moral law, of which He said, "that not one jot or one tittle should pass away till all was fulfilled." He makes its fulfilment easier to us, He points out the way in which it can be obeyed; instead of obedience to the precepts, "Thou shalt not," He leads us into the regions of liberty, and gives us the greatness of the command, "Thou shalt." But we must rise to its dignity, and we must recognise the importance of the law as a thing not to be tampered with, not to be set on one side. Obliterate the Ten Commandments, wipe them

out, and say they are not God's word, and where is morality, where is the basis of society, where do we stand? Oh! of old times, men who took convenience as the foundation of civil life, what monstrous forms of oppression, what terrible displays of passion, what uncontrolled lusts ravaged them and brought flourishing civilisations to the ground!

And it would be so again if once the law of God is not recognised as the law of God, if once the distinction between right and wrong is supposed to be something that men can discuss and men can arrange according to their own will—then farewell to the conception of righteousness, farewell to the effort after holiness, farewell to any chance of man's salvation! The discipline of the law was applied to the people of Israel, on that discipline soul after soul waxed strong, and they all in some degree were raised to an intelligence of greater capacities and gained a foretaste of possible powers. But the law was their teacher, and the end of the law was Christ, Christ the end of the law to establish righteousness. And that righteousness is held before us in the picture of the judgment, and our soul's progress must be from Christ our Saviour unto Christ our Judge; Christ, who gives us the means to attain to righteousness, will judge us according as we have corresponded to what He supplied.

"Christ the end of the law to every one that believeth." Yes, the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ; by recognising the supremacy of the law of duty we may be strengthened to look upon the face of our Saviour, to bend the knee to Him, to submit ourselves unto Him, to reach out our hands, and strive to make Him ours.

THE LIGHT OF THE AGES.

By the Rev. G. F. TERRY, L.Th.

Sermon Preached in St. Peter's Church, Bayswater, on Sunday Evening, January 13th, 1895.

"For with Thee is the fountain of life, and in Thy light shall we see light."—Psalm xxxvi. 9.

THE picture in the mind of the Psalmist is very clear. Men ages ago, as to-day, are looking for light; with insatiable passion they are running here and there seeking to gain more light and more knowledge. The dying cry of the modern philosopher is, "Light, more light, while time shall last!" and the Psalmist is in true sympathy with this quest; to him light seems the most precious thing on earth, knowledge the treasure most worth possessing. But it seems to him that there is something which needs to be suggested to these searchers after light. They appear to be questioning this thing and that thing, as if the secret of its being, its power to be understood, were something which it carried in itself. He sees things differently, to him everything is capable of being understood only as it exists within the great unfolding presence of God. And here, I think, we have a great lesson for the world of to-day. Brought face to face with the majestic unity and continuity of life and law in the natural world, men are urgent in their demand for certitude also in the realm of spiritual truth; they are turning wistful eyes to that miracle-worker of the age, modern science, and as they watch with interest her stately march, they recall with horror the awful crimes which often held civilisation in check, and even outrivalled the enormities of paganism, under Papal Christianity—from the days of Cyril, when, at the altar of the All-merciful God, mad monks of Alexandria tore the fair flesh of the maiden Hypatia from her dainty limbs, by way of argument against the truths of mathematics which she taught; from that day to the time when, by order of the Inquisition, Bruno, the astronomer, was burnt alive; or when, later still, Galileo, the Florentine, at seventy years of age, knelt before the bench of cardinals in Rome, and did falsely swear that the sun was not the centre of the earth's motion; or when, little more than a century ago, the Fellows of our Royal Society were pursued through the streets of London as Atheists. Aye, it were easy to bring the charge down to a more recent moment, even to the days which are glorified by the industry of Newton and Darwin, of Tyndall and Huxley. Alas, that these things should be so.

"Sirs, ye are brethren," was the voice of the Church of old to warring kings; we would that it had been more frequently applied in later times. Even to-day men have yet to learn that truth has many aspects, and no one has any monopoly of it. Have you ever read the "Vision of God's Light"? I remember reading it, some time ago, in one of our daily evening papers, and I make bold to quote it to you. The seer is wrapped in cloudland, but, "One by one the clouds are lifted, and the veil of mist is withdrawn, making visible a great mountain range, upon which eternal snow lies frozen white, and their cold high peaks seemed very far away; but one bar of luminous gold lightened their slopes towards the east, and in that warm and tender haze the snow had melted and the flowers opened their blooms.

* * * * *

"Two dark figures of men advanced into the light. They had climbed for many weary hours; they had seen the radiance from afar, and now they entered it together. They were brothers in their common lot, and as they stepped into the golden glory their brows grew heavy with distrust and wrath. 'What doest thou here?' said the one; '*the light is mine!*' 'Nay, fool,' said the other, 'thou liest; *the light is mine!*' and the evil frown deepened and they fought—fought with merciless blind fury for every inch of that wondrous light,

until suddenly a shadow fell, and the shadow's name was Death, and their hot blood sank into the cool brown earth—and God's light lay still upon the mountains." Have we not here a picture of the attitude of many Christians? Not without good grounds, then, do men call upon the Church of God to justify her claim to guide us in such days as these, and our answer must ever be the Psalmist's answer, as he stands in the midst of the light-seekers and cries, "With Thee, and Thee alone, O God, is the fountain of life, and in Thy light shall we see light." The so-called estrangement between religion and science is already seen in the highest quarters on both sides to be utterly foreign to the truest teachings of either. It has been recently pointed out that a modern discovery illustrates this deep truth that "God is light." Chemical research has shown us that, while the prism divides light into seven-fold elements of colour, there are ultra-violet rays beyond the seven which we cannot discover with the eye, and of which we have no suspicion, so that even as light is only partially apprehensible to the eye, so God is but partially apprehensible to our finite minds. When the Emperor Trajan pressed the Rabbi Joshua to show him his God, in vain the Jew replied that his God, though everywhere present, was invisible. The emperor insisted, and the other replied, "Come, then, with me; I will first show you one of His ambassadors." He led the emperor into the open air; it was about mid-day, and no cloud obscured the sun. The rabbi desired the emperor to look at it. "How can I, man?" said the latter; "the light blinds me." Then the Jew said, "Art thou unable to endure the light of one of God's creatures, and yet dost thou desire to behold the infinitely brighter glory of the Creator? Such a light would not only dazzle thee, it would destroy thee." And so, my brethren, it is only in and through the God-man, Christ Jesus, that we can see the light of God transmitted in one continuous, glorious, and undivided ray. In all human saintliness and holiness we see the same light reflected indeed from Him, but broken up by its refractory media into all the imperfect yet lovely colours of the world. The main lesson of nineteen centuries of Christian history teaches us that all which mankind has ever known of the best and greatest has been derived from Him who is the Light of the World. If you would have examples, ask the aged martyr-saint, Polycarp. "Renounce Christ!" stormed the pro-consul. "Eighty and six years have I served Him," answered the aged bishop, "and He hath done me no wrong. How can I speak evil of my King and my Saviour?" Ask the holy Thomas à Kempis, and he will tell you, "When Jesus is present, all is well, and nothing seems difficult; but when Jesus is absent, everything is hard." Ask Thomas Aquinas, who, when asked the source of his amazing knowledge, pointed in silence to a cross.

I might go on indefinitely and bring for your witness the saints of God in every age, who would all answer, "Our lives were holy and calm because they were lived in the light of God." Thank God there have been, there are, men whose faith becomes the power of inspiration for everything they do; everything shines with the light and works with the strength of their religion. Think of our great reformers, like Wycliffe, Luther or Cromwell, or of our divine poets, like Milton or Dante, or our noble soldiers, like Havelock or Gordon—to these and thousands of others Christ was their "*Revealer*" as well as their "*Redeemer.*" It was truly said by the late great American Bishop, Phillips Brooks: "Our religion is not a system of ideas about Christ; it is Christ; and remember He says, to believe in Him is not to say a creed, not to join a Church, but to have a great, a strong, and a Divine Master whom we perfectly love and perfectly trust, who is always compelling us to seek the light and to find the deepest truth, which is in one great utterance of it—that we are the sons of God." It was a shrewd instinct of the old grammarians which led them to derive the Greek word for a man, ἄνθρωπος, from an origin which means "the one who looks upward." The instinct led them well: the upward yearning of the soul of man belongs to his very nature. How, therefore, shall we Christians frame our lives that we may for ever behold the true light? Ask the Apostle of light, St. John, who tells us that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all, and he will flash forth the answer: "He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself to walk even as He walked." If we would have fellowship with God, we must walk in the light, as He is in the light. If we love the charnel-house of death and darkness, then the light shineth in vain and the darkness comprehendeth it not. The condition, then, of fellowship with God is that there should be no darkness in us, no subterfuges, no duplicity, no dishonest and guilty concealments, no hidden chambers of the temple, full of sin and shame, no self-deceit, no mask of hypocrisy, nothing jesuitical. We cannot deceive God by mere outward service. God, the true Light, reads our inmost thoughts; He trieth the very hearts and reins, and His piercing light reveals man's sin. The first thing for a man to do, if he would behold the true light, is to put away his sin, to try to be pure and true and honest. Alas! we all know how hard this is. What true preacher is there who does not find it necessary to spend most of his time in preaching, not only to others, but to himself, on this theme? In our own strength we cannot gain the victory; this can only be by God's Holy Spirit. Therefore we must ever pray for strength and grace—

> Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,
> And lighten with celestial fire.
> Anoint and cheer our soiled face
> With the abundance of Thy grace.

Pray anxiously, pray passionately, in the simplest of all words. Remember that prayer is the manliest thing a man can do, the fastening of his life on to the Eternal, the drinking of his thirsty soul out of the great Fountain of Life. In the light of prayer God's light comes into our souls. Prayer is as the opening of the windows of the soul; it is as a signal to God, an invitation that He may come in and fill our souls with heavenly light. Jesus, the Light of the World, our souls must have, He that is and was and is to be. Yes, a larger, fuller, more completely comprehended Christ is waiting to reveal Himself in the souls of men when they can bear the greater light, which shall make the world more glorious and more joyous. Into every soul, just so far and just so fast as it is possible for that soul to receive it, God beats down His revealing light and gives His help. Does not this Epiphany season remind us how the Gentile who sat in darkness saw the great light, and rose to hail it, to our lasting benefit? And so, throughout the world, wherever the beams of God's Light shine, true hearts leap up and reflect them. So it must be with us; the light is for all, it is shining on us, and we must rise to receive it and reflect it, in our turn, upon others. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Here we must often be content with twilight; we have not perfect light. But if in this life we have striven and sought for light, striven against error in all its forms, and sought illumination to mind and soul, then one day the veil which now hides the unseen, which obscures the perfect light, will be taken away, and we shall know even as we are known; we shall wake up after Christ's likeness, and be satisfied with it, in that eternal and glorious land where neither sun nor moon do shine, but the glory of God does lighten it, and the Lamb is the Light thereof.

Meanwhile along the narrow, rugged path
Thyself hast trod,
Lead, Saviour, lead us home in childlike faith,
Home to our God,
To rest for ever, after earthly strife,
In the calm *light* of everlasting life.

Amen.

It is stated that there are in Birmingham only 133 clergy, and church accommodation for 57,451 persons out of an estimated population of 589,961. There are four parishes with a population of over 20,000; seven others with 15,000 and upwards; and fifteen others with 10,000 and upwards.

In our review of the beautiful religious portfolio, "Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee," last week, we omitted to mention that it was published by *News of the World*, Limited, at 9 and 10, Whitefriars Street, E.C. We regret that this omission has occasioned several of our readers to make personal inquiries, at which we are not surprised, because similar pictures of events in the Life of Jesus were the chief attraction in the Paris salon at the Palais d'Industrie last year.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1895.

MODERATELY PROGRESSIVE.

It is plain that there will be a stiff tussle over the London County Council elections next March. Already the ground is beginning to be cleared. As things are nowadays, this is not surprising; and yet, when we come to look at it, there seems very little to choose, in point of principle, between the parties. Progressives and Moderates alike claim to be advocates of liberality and progress, both have the interests of London at heart. There appears to be really only one radical difference in principle—the question of the City.

The Progressives are for sweeping away the ancient Corporation of the City of London. This is at the root of all their proposals for adjusting the relations between the Corporation and the County Council. It is the old question of the lion and the lamb. The only permanent resting-place for the lamb is intended to be inside the lion. On the part of the Progressives the matter is considered to be past the stage of argument.

Moderate men will not agree with them. Is progress impossible without destruction? We cannot believe it. The English instinct is, in the main, conservative. From time to time in our history it has been led astray; but it has righted itself. In rare moments of upheaval and excitement we have dispensed with the Church, with the Crown, even with Parliament. We have taken them back again when we were clothed and in our right mind. And yet more may be said for the anti Church and the anti-Crown people than for the anti-Corporation. The ordinary common person cannot see the pressing necessity for the absorption of the City; and the man who respects tradition and reveres antiquity, and holds sacred the continuity of human

ties, hates the perpetual cry, "Tear down." His interest in the present and his hope for the future depend upon the process of orderly growth and development out of the past. "The old order changeth, yielding place to new," is the bed-rock principle of progress. But the modern Progressive is for the prompt extinction of the old order, and the immediate introduction of a brand-new one.

No doubt the relations of Corporation and Council must be readjusted. But in so delicate a matter there is need of the old Scotch motto, "Gang warily." It is easy to break up the mechanism of a fine old clock; he shows more technical skill and truer artistic feeling who mends it and sets it going again.

But there are other relations to be adjusted also, those of the Council to the metropolis. It is not too much to say that these are as yet only in the improvised stage. The present majority on the London County Council does not take what the late Bishop Phillips Brooks, of Massachusetts, would have called "whole views" of its responsibilities. It is impressed with an ardent desire to promote the welfare of certain sections and classes. It does not seem to have yet learned the lesson of catholicity. Its motives are one-sided; it is open to bias and swayed by prejudice. It began its term by an abuse of its privileges, deliberately suppressing the minority and swelling its own numbers by electing aldermen exclusively from its own partisans. This was an outrage against the English sense of fair play, and was protested against even by newspapers conducted in its own interests. In fact, the Council ignored the whole body of electors who voted Moderate, as if they were no part of the population of London. There is no Parliamentary or municipal precedent in modern times for such a proceeding. This has prevented Londoners, as a whole, from looking upon the County Council as their Council. It belongs only to a part of them. On the other hand, it has prevented the Council from caring for the interests and listening to the opinions of all London. It is only concerned with those who voted one way; the others are of no account.

This indifference to other people's opinions has been carried, in some of the actions of the Council, to extreme lengths. It has sometimes stultified itself, as in the case of the Tower Bridge. The public works needed to make the new bridge of much practical service have been indefinitely postponed because of the betterment question. Without arguing the abstract right and wrong of betterment, it may be said that the principle is absolutely new to Englishmen. Opinion is divided about it on the moral side; of its practical working we have no experience whatever; its introduction into our system would be a minor revolution, opening up many questions—"worsement," for one—of which no one can quite see the end. And yet, because such a novel and revolutionary principle was not accepted by Parliament on the *ipse dixit* of the Progressive majority—which had, be it remembered, entirely ignored the opinions of its Moderate colleagues—important public works, agreed to by everybody, have been indefinitely postponed or deprived of usefulness. This is quite enough to cause a plain man to doubt the wisdom, though he admits the *bona fides*, of the Progressives. And this unwisdom is carried into other matters. In Parliamentary proceedings, there has been lavish expenditure in promoting Bills, the rejection of which was a foregone conclusion. Chiefly, it would seem, out of pique, the Council have returned again and again to the charge with proposals which had already been decisively refused, entailing waste of time and labour and money. On the Council there appears to be a determination, in spite of the disastrous experience of other towns, at home and abroad, to work the tramways as municipal concerns; and there have been quaint administrative mistakes, such as painting Hammersmith Bridge in winter, and turfing Wandsworth Common in the heat of summer. All these are the result of want of experience, want of tact, and occasionally want of common sense, on the part of individuals who are unaccustomed to look all round at things, and fail to distinguish between theory and practice—well-meaning, but wrong-minded.

The policy, or want of policy, of which all these are samples, has caused a deep-seated distrust of the present majority as administrators. We all have at heart the abolition of sweating, keeping the streets morally and physically clean, good housing and good feeding of all classes, pure amusements, pure water, pure air, the development and encouragement of all that is good, the suppression and eradication of all that is bad and degrading in municipal and social affairs. If we thought the Progressives the most likely persons to give us these, we should be Progressive. But, as matters stand, we think we shall get them sooner from the Moderates, all the more because the Moderates are not hampered by the bad political traditions of the Progressives, who are tainted with the mischievous opportunism and the acute partisan rancour which has been Mr. Gladstone's last, and worst, legacy to his country. The Progressives are bound up in the Gladstonian tradition, which all hands agree is doomed. Some of them may shake themselves free. It is quite possible that a purified Progressive majority, ballasted by a stronger Moderate minority, may be returned next March, and it might work usefully and satisfactorily. But it is more likely that there will be a Moderate majority, distinctly pledged to the best principles, but not to the foibles and eccentricities, of the Progressives. And this, we hope, will be the case.

THE Bishop of Exeter completed his seventieth year on Friday, the 25th ult.

CHURCH NOTES.

No appointment has yet been made to the See of Hereford, which was vacated by Dr. Atlay's death on the 24th of December, or at least none has been announced. Among the names which have been mentioned as those of more or less likely selections is that of a well-known Welsh clergyman, who is, however, in entire ignorance on the subject.

We can confirm the statement which has appeared in some of the daily papers that the Bishop of London has withdrawn the licence of the Rev. A. E. Briggs, one of the assistant curates of St. Mark's, Marylebone, a church which has been notorious for some time for extreme ritual. The gravamen of Mr. Briggs' offence is stated to be his public teaching in favour of devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Mr. Briggs officiated at St. Mark's last Sunday, a fact which is perhaps explained by his intention to appeal against the Bishop's action to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Bishop of Coventry, Dr. Knox, preached his farewell sermon at Aston on Sunday, the 13th inst. The living, after having been refused by more than one clergyman, has been accepted by the Rev. F. S. Webster, rector of St. Thomas's, Birmingham. Like his predecessor, Mr. Webster is a decided Evangelical. He has been rector of St. Thomas's since 1889 and was previously in London, where he held office in the Church Army.

We have to record the sudden death of the rector of Bethnal Green, the Rev. Septimus Hansard. Little notice is taken in the Church papers of the decease of a most meritorious clergyman, who had the misfortune to belong to no party. The *Record* does say, however, that, "like Dr. William Rogers of St. Botolph's, and other neighbouring incumbents, he accomplished much to reform life and manners in the dreariest districts of East London." The vacated benefice is worth £400 a year gross, with a house, and is in the gift of the Bishop of London.

Some interesting information about the Church in Canada is contained in the *Religious Review of Reviews* for the 15th of January, in the form of an interview with Archbishop Lewis, of Ontario. "We know no parties," said the Archbishop, replying to a question; "some churches are called Low, some High churches, as far as these cant phrases mean anything. We are singularly free from extremes on either side." Asked about re-union, Dr. Lewis made a reply which will perhaps astonish some of the enthusiasts for that consummation. "I do not see," he said, "that any wholesale re-union would be any benefit, or even a blessing. What we have to do now is to try and bring about re-union by individuals and families. To my mind, wholesale re-union would be a curse at the present time. A Pan-Anglican Synod unites Churchmen all the world over."

The Archbishop told his interviewer that it was he who suggested the Pan-Anglican gathering in the first instance. "He came over and saw Archbishop Longley, and persuaded him to set the matter in motion, and he was well satisfied with the result."

The *Religious Review of Reviews* purports on its title-page to be "the busy Churchman's magazine," and it seems to fulfil that profession very fairly. But we are simply amazed that a periodical designed for Churchmen, busy or idle, and edited by Canon Fleming, should publish such an article as that in the present number on "The New Secularism." It is an apology for what is called "the Labour Church," of which Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. Tom Mann are supporters. The article is ignorantly, flippantly, and offensively written, and how it found its way into print must, we should think, puzzle everyone who reads it. As it is unsigned, it is in form an editorial utterance, but that is impossible. We can only suppose that Canon Fleming, who is himself a "busy Churchman," has for once failed to exercise adequate supervision over his contributors.

The Bishop of Gloucester, in his pastoral letter, expresses warm approval of the report of the Archbishops' Committee on voluntary schools, and concludes with some excellent words of advice to the clergy. "I again reiterate," he says, "the counsel of last year's letter, Don't lose heart; strain a little longer every nerve to maintain your schools; relief may be nearer at hand than we may think; the darkest hour of the night is often the hour before the dawning of the day."

Dr. Ellicott takes a decided line on the consecration of Bishop Cabrera. Replying to a memorial in condemnation of Lord Plunket's action, the Bishop says:—"I do not at present see what steps can be taken to mitigate the injurious effects arising from the irregular and unauthorised proceeding, but I can readily assure you that I shall heartily co-operate in any action that may be devised for the satisfaction of the Church under the exceptional circumstances to which you invite my attention."

According to the news from Rome last week, Cardinal Vaughan, who has been visiting the Pope, has informed his Holiness that there is no immediate or early probability of the conversion of England to the Roman obedience. The Cardinal hopes, however, for an increasing number of individual conversions, "especially among the Ritualists and more enlightened classes." The Pope is said to have been considerably disillusioned by this information, as he had been led to entertain the belief that this country was almost ripe for union with the See of Peter.

A lay correspondent informs the *Record* that he has been invited to consider a new attack on belief promoted by atheists. The method is the systematic circulation of literature. A course of reading antagonistic to Faith is recommended. Works bearing the names of Bradlaugh, Comte, Draper, Ingersoll, Haeckel, Huxley, Laing, and "Saladin" are included in the list. Canon Driver will learn with regret and astonishment that he, too, is pressed into the service of this assault.

Fifty-four sermons were preached in London and the country on the day which has been designated for the last two or three years "Museum Sunday." According to the secretary of the Lord's Day Society, the preachers comprised twelve English clergyman, two Scotch Presbyterians, one Baptist, one Independent, one Theist, one Positivist, two "Ethicals," and thirty-four Unitarians. As heretofore, the Roman Catholics held entirely aloof from the movement.

Teachers have often been exhorted to make sure that their scholars understand their teaching, but the advice must be reiterated when such proofs of its necessity are forthcoming as the following. The story is printed by "Peter Lombard" in the *Church Times* as authentic:—An inspector, examining a school in

a large railway centre, asked, "What does Epiphany mean?" One boy replied, "A porter," another, "A ticket-collector," a third, "A signalman." Whereupon the inspector made inquiries as to what the children had been taught, and he found that they had with one consent converted the ordinary explanation of Epiphany as a manifestation into "a man-of-a-station."

MISSIONARY activity goes on in China, notwithstanding the war. In a newspaper received by this week's mail we read:—"The missionaries have been making hay while the sun shines in the city of Chêng-tu, the capital of a province having thirty million inhabitants. An examination was recently held there for the second degree of 'Chujén,' or M.A. There were only 129 degrees to be given, and the candidates numbered from 14,000 to 15,000. They were all 'penned up in little stalls, too small to lie down in at full length, for nine days, with only two intervals at the end of each three days.' The missionaries of the National Bible Society of Scotland resolved to take advantage of the occasion, and present to each competitor a copy of the Bible, and the Central China Religious Tract Society followed suit with a book by Dr. John, entitled 'Gate of Virtue and Knowledge.' The Hsien magistrate allowed the nine missionary distributors to take their stand inside the outer court of the examination hall, and moreover gave them twelve runners to protect them. Ten thousand six hundred students are said to have 'gladly received the books.'"

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—I change not. "I am the Lord, I change not" (Mal. iii. 6). Introduction.—God's will and mind changes not regarding His promises with His people; God's word remains firm. There is no variableness or shadow of turning in the Lord our God; heaven and earth would rather pass away than His word, all His promises have been, and will be, fulfilled to the close of this dispensation, therefore our faith need not be shaken, come what may, for hath He not promised, and shall He not fulfil? When we behold the things of this sublunary state, although the world is growing old, yet changes are constantly going on. The rise and fall of empires, the mightiest of earth have come and gone in times of peace and war, in times of plague and famime, earthquakes and fearful disruptions—all these things have come and gone; millions of the human race have been born and played their part in the world's drama. They have gone, yes. "It is appointed unto man once to die, and after this the judgment." There is nothing in this life but what changes and passes away. But in our text we read of One who changes not, we read of One who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. "I am the Lord, I change not." In such a One we are called upon to repose all our hope, and rest our weary souls on His infinite power, since none but Him is able to bear us up, since He alone changes not, and is able to sustain the weakest of His creatures. Learn a few lessons from this subject:—(1) The Lord Jesus is our best friend, He knows all about us. (2) The Lord Jesus never changes, He knows our weakness and need. (3) The Lord Jesus brought us salvation, He came to cheer up our sorrows, and give us liberty of soul. (4) The Lord Jesus proved His infinite love by His death on the cross for our sake. (5) The Christian's home is not here, but eternal in heaven.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

Reviews and Notices.

"MISSIONARY METHODS OF THE EVANGELISATION OF THE NON-CHRISTIAN WORLD." By Robert Needham Cust, LL.D. London: Luzac & Co.

IF but half the holes Dr. Cust picks in the missionary's rotten coat are justified—and if we compare these intrepid public protests with the whispers of foreign residents we are afraid they are—his book, "Missionary Methods," ought to overturn the whole present system or want of system which we so cheerfully support for the benefit of "the heathen." The optimist may see good in holes as he has seen advantages in heathenism—he may gaily agree with the Arabian philosopher, "Blessed is he whose coat is full of rents, for he can put his hand out at any one of them:" and if the missionary has used the holes for his own purposes, or made more by mistake, he has done no worse than is done every day in commerce, politics, and the domestic relations—only, as Dr. Cust severely points out, commerce, politics, and the domestic relations are no business of the missionary, and a special standard is expected from him. Anyway, a book which is avowedly an attack, and will be read by "heathens" as well as Christians, cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. It comes in the nick of time, close on the centenary celebration of the London Missionary Society, founded by Dr. Haweis and Rev. David Bogue in 1795, for "the funeral of bigotry"; and Dr. Cust says with Baxter, "I have excepted those who are not guilty, and therefore I hope that I have injured none."

Not for an instant does Dr. Cust deny all credit to the devoted men and women who year after year go out, and stay out, in bad climates and repellent surroundings, in the hope of bringing to Christ those "other sheep that are not of My fold":—with a measure of success, indeed, which seems to prove that the Lord Himself is on our side. They are doing good work, holy work, thankless work, with no regard to worldly profit or of personal comfort. It is because the work is holy and the labourers few that the prophet lifts up his voice, not to flatter the good missionary, but to rebuke the bad one, and to open the rheumy eyes of that "Blatant Beast," the great B. P., to the fact that the money subscribed does not always go precisely whither the subscriber intended. No doubt amid the vast ramifications of our over-centralised Missionary Societies some mistakes are bound to be made, though the mistakes need not be so salient nor so grave in their results. No doubt we trust too much to "organisation," and subscribe unintelligently enough to a cause with a good name. Old ladies in the country, and "fat old clergymen," as Dr. Cust puts it, fidget around with Mission-boxes, which the servant girls put up with, and the children dread, and the shopkeepers allow for, seeing that toll is constantly taken of wages, and Christmas-boxes, and cash payments, "for the poor dear heathen," and that is all many of us know or care about foreign missions and missionaries. But enormous sums are actually collected (sums sorely wanted for our own heathens) by these and many better means, thousands of good people believing, as did the mediæval sinner when the Pardoner rattled *his* little box, that for every penny put in a soul jumps out of hell fire; and as missions involve many issues outside soul-saving, it is time the "Blatant Beast"

roused up a little. Dr. Cust says the time is past for bullying and boasting, and calls loudly for "Re-organisation." His chapters on the financial department are very scathing. Misdoings, mismanagement, concessions, suppressions in the Reports, are bringing the grand scheme and scope of our great Missionary Associations down to the level of a venal and often mischievous commercial enterprise. New methods, in harmony with our increasing understanding of Orientals and our sense of international justice and amity, and Christ's tolerance, have got to come in force, together with more rigid supervision of the workers and restr ctions on the funds.

The catalogue of contents of the book is alone startling. Dr. Cust, a civilian indeed, but one who has been for fifty years devoted heart and soul to the one great subject of evangelisation, and for considerably over a quarter of a century Inspector of Missions in India, Turkey, Palestine, Egypt, and Morocco, as well as a student of missionary literature in five languages, must be accepted as an authority. His headings touch on imposture, disloyalty, defiance, and absence of training. The book is divided into three parts, but is too exhaustive for us to deal categorically with the good methods—methods not recommended, and bad methods. Still, a few points may be noted, on which outsiders have long suspiciously hung, and suspicion means withdrawal, in the long run, of public support. The political point is one, for the mischievousness of Missions has been commented on very often. What has Mission work (asks Dr. Cust) and conversion, which is surely the education and vivifying of the spiritual nature in unspiritual communities, to do with party questions, diplomatic interposition, military schemes, a gunboat, or even the Education Commission? What has spirituality to do with planting cotton, distilling liquors, sport, shooting elephants, dealing in ivory and ostriches, and inciting to agrarian revolt? The extraordinary breadth of the missionary's view of his duty in some places is hardly credible. Insults to chieftains and to native religious convictions in localities where ancient culture and education of the most beneficent kind offer a reproachful example of toleration and mercy, the illegal trial and execution of natives, shooting and wounding natives, bribing natives with firearms, and the most dangerous offences against native national and domestic rights and customs—these are but a few of the blunders which have come under Dr. Cust's eye. The natural difficulties under the best conditions he does not blink; and some of us who remember Stevenson's picture of the missionary magnate Attwater may realise how and why certain missionaries may have come to combine the apostle with the soldier and the merchant, whilst others, who sympathise with the strong common-sense appeals for justice and decent courtesy to heathens of all sorts who are not savages, may remember how the rage against English mismanagement of natives in Samoa accelerated Stevenson's death but the other day.

In his sincere desire for lasting Christian influence, Dr. Cust fulminates against the tilting by missionaries—whose business it is not—at caste, opium, infant marriage, ancestral worship, slavery, and other legal customs that few who are foreign to the country properly understand. "Until the civil power abolishes the status of slavery, the Church can only look on with sorrow." The missionary has no right to set himself up as a "friend" of oppressed people against their lawful rulers, or employ the arm of the flesh in a spiritual contest. "It is a monstrous abuse of the hospitality of a friendly state for a resident alien" (page 238). Dr. Cust was one of the magistrates in the *émeute* in Banáras in 1852. He accompanied a regiment to enforce obedience, and all was settled without bloodshed. "Unknown to us a party of young missionaries made a sudden attack on a private house of a Brahmin, captured the wife of a convert who had been withheld from him, and made her drink a cup of tea, and thus break her caste, and live with her husband." This was a grave outrage, and might have led to bloodshed. In spite of the great forbearance shown by the family, he implies that the affair caused the death of the poor child-wife. The missionary's arrogance is often the direct cause of the ill-feeling they excite in China. Interference with parental rights and domestic duty seems to be frequent, and the carnal man rides riot sometimes. Even in the Societies' Reports the "marriage bells sound merrily throughout,' and the carnal is oddly mixed up with the spiritual in the missionary's ideas of life. A whole chapter is devoted to missionary marriages. Nothing can be stronger than the protest against early marriage and continually increasing families. He lashes with the sternness of love the young sensualists who become missionaries because they wish to marry, and they do marry at an age when marriage is impossible to a young clerk, banker, soldier, or any other class of man. The enormous annual subscriptions go largely to clothing, educating, and carrying to and fro these unnecessary families. A missionary has no right, he says again and again, to marry unless the wife is herself consecrated to the work and ready to sacrifice herself. In many climates even this is not permissible, the young women die like flies. And we are reluctantly reminded of that naughty story, which we hoped was a myth, when the missionary going to the coast to meet his fifth consignment from headquarters of a helpmeet, fell back in dismay—"O criky, *again* red hair?"

No missionary ought to be permitted to marry till he has been at his post for ten years, and the author tells some shrewd home-truths about mission-funds being wasted on holidays for sick wives who never ought to have gone out, education and toys for babies who never ought to have been born, and about the marriage of daughters to missionaries for the sake of the pension.

Dr. Cust is perfectly explicit on the obvious duty of a missionary (page 221) who has unfortunately married a woman who cannot stand the climate where his work is cast. He is consecrated to the Lord; his marriage is not greater than his mission, his mission must come first. Many missionaries have been too self-indulgent to see the two duties in their right proportion, and have relinquished the service of God and the cure of the great sores of the world to come home and idle with a family, and spend their lives in going to tea-parties and collecting money to decorate Mission churches. In contradistinction to the Imitation Missionary, he quotes the words of Bishop Steere (who, after a long separation from his wife, died at his post): "It is a very nice question of conscience how far a man who leaves his post because his wife is ill can suppose himself one of those who are expected to leave everything for Christ." They leave just as much as they want to and no more, for "egoism is the very essence of family life." The service of God "requires the entire crucifying of the carnal man" (page 220), and

when in our own comfortable country we observe what helpless helpmeets the clergy select sometimes, or are selected by, and how frequently the parson's wife is the cause of all the parish squabbles, we agree with Dr. Cust that there is something to be said for the celibacy of the missionary. "The really offensive suggestion (he says) that a missionary in Africa must be married, should not be entertained." "I myself spent ten years entirely alone, or with one or two celibate companions, in the midst of the people over whose secular interests I had to watch. I remember how greatly the work was advanced by entire freedom from family and social duties and cares, how subjects of doubt could be discussed earnestly and thoroughly, how before dawn I was in the saddle surrounded by natives who came to accompany me, how my heart went out to them, because they were the sole objects of my interest, if such were the case in community life or solitary life, whilst employed on earthly business, how much more when the heart is given to spiritual business by spiritually-minded men!" A picturesque sketch of a beautiful and effectual life!

It is reassuring to find that an author who is so down on the obstructive wife is not down on women in general. Of female Missionary Associations he says "God bless them!" and of the devoted Female Evangelist "she is as the vision of an angel from heaven" (page 13). Experienced women should be eligible for a seat in Committee. On the vexed question of missionary morality he is explicit. The young man must go forth self-consecrated—and he *can*—to wrestle with the heathen (and, by the way, the heathen are *not* the sister Christian churches, Armenian and Roman Catholic, page 276); he is to preach by example. "The lamentable failures of the most ordinary and vulgar laws of morality that have occurred lately are appalling"; and he adds significantly, "Those who have made moral lapses *have all been widowers or married men*" (page 211), which proves the original physical unfitness of particular workers, and conveys a shrewd warning. But he says he has never heard a breath of scandal against missionaries in India, either Protestant or Catholic.

There are two more very serious matters touched on. The fundamental question, whether proselytism is not altogether an impertinence in a highly civilised nation, is very complex. Share with them our lights—yes; throw open to them the door which has led us to the peace which passeth all understanding—by all means; but force our particular Shibboleth on a people fifty times more elevated and more educated than the emissary—Query? (page 255). This was the rebuff thrown at us by the intellectual, and often highly spiritual Brahmin delegates at the Parliament of Religion held at Chicago in 1893. Let us reflect further, says Dr. Cust (and every Anglo-Indian and Anglo-Persian will echo his words), what example of Christian moral life, what ideal of Christ's love, Europeans set in Mohammedan countries. Every great religion has a substratum of adamantine Truth, and the missionary's own conduct reflects on the power of his Prophet. Sneers at old-established Oriental ceremonial worship will neither conciliate nor convince. He quotes from a religious paper the cant of a returned missionary from Agra and Banáras "which raised a foolish smile" because "a bell was rung to awaken the household god,—but the whole story was inexpressibly sad!" Are no bells rung before and during our own divine service? Surely bells have been used in the ritual of almost every creed we know anything of, and some scientists suspect direct connection between metallic sound-waves and the unknown electric conditions governing spiritual forces.

The final point, a strong one that militates against our real influence in the East, is our apparent insincerity. Do we propose to lay down railway lines or touch tobacco or tea, the commercial project at once associates itself in the native mind with proselytism rousing intense but secret antagonism; similarly they connect the religious effort with an "eye to the main chance," because we have so long mingled religion with profitable commerce. The peasantry are afraid. The educated classes ask if our religion is what it professes to be, show us its effect on its professors.

They come to England, visit our Universities, our law-courts, our Haymarket and Strand on the eve of our Holy-day; they find a condition of things subsisting in our acres of crowded slums to which there is no parallel in a Mohammedan town or village, and they go home with a poor opinion of our integrity and our vaunted Christ. What right have we to preach to others, they quote at us, "whilst we ourselves are cast away?" *Let us look at home* (page 267.) Some Christian inconsistencies are unanswerable. As regards Mohammedan polygamy, under the Koranic laws the rights of the woman are protected. How about Christian profligacy?—Cruelty! How about Ma-Tabéleland, where poor Africans are killed for the sake of gold dust and to make commercial companies pay? *Let us look at home.*" Whilst foreign marriage customs are frequently independent of religious belief and a question merely of civil ordinance determined by the ethical standard of the majority, there is no heathen country which at once teaches the highest altruism and personal self-control, yet permits and maintains a large class primarily to incite and minister to vice, and secondarily to radiate disease, which inculcates mercy and forbids the ritual of sacrifice of dumb animals and birds, whilst legalising certain forms of cruelty and leaving to private enterprise the formation of a children's protective society. These things perplex the heathen mind and makes him distrust either our science or our religion, or both, and the missionary has uphill work to convince him of sin. Dr. Cust's last chapter is an eloquent epitome of his appeal for toleration and equity in dealing with the members of innumerable religious sects which our missionaries do not adequately study; and whilst, as we have said, he does full justice to such devoted men as those whose sufferings and escapes have recently moved the reading public (in the Mahdi's camp and elsewhere), his animadversions are forcible and *public*. In the great centres a strong quickening movement is making itself felt outside the Church and dangerously near its foundations. Hosts of people are beginning to reflect and to work who never before cast a thought to reform; travellers pass with celerity from hemisphere to hemisphere, and can form their own opinions whilst carrying with them the seeds of Western enlightenment, and nothing can be more damaging to our influence abroad and to our Church at home than an open challenge like the book before us, if unanswered and unrepelled.

For the remedial measures proposed by Dr. Cust we refer our readers to the book, which is full of sound common sense. They are, briefly, decentralise: abolish the Children's Home: avoid sensationalism, cant, meddling, fads, and avoid

underrating "the heathen." And overhaul the accounts.

"This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

M. H.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CONFORMITY v. NONCONFORMITY.

SIR,—Mr. Docker rather misstates his Dissenting friend's remark on the condition of the Church. Mr. Berry's words, as he quotes them, speak of Evangelicalism holding a more logical position in the Dissenting bodies than it does in the Church; he does not say, nor intimate that I can see, that those bodies themselves hold a more logical position than the Church. There may be a good deal said in favour of Mr. Berry's contention. If we understand by "Evangelicalism" what I think is commonly understood by that term, there are parts of that system of doctrine which are not consistent with Church principles. That system does not ignore the Church absolutely, but it takes a view of what the Church is that is not the view of other schools of thought in the Church, and that is not, in my belief, the view of the Holy Scriptures. The Scriptures teach, if I understand them rightly, that the Church is a society founded on the day of Pentecost, of which society all persons baptised are members. Evangelicalism, as I understand it, teaches that the Church consists of converted persons; the Dissenting bodies regard it likewise. This is logical enough on the part of those bodies but it is illogical on the part of Churchmen, and inconsistent with what we call Church principles.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

January 28th.

THE SINAI PALIMPSEST.

SIR,—I am very glad that my remarks have called forth the letter of "J. P.," but I cannot agree with his verdict on Codex D, and I venture to think Professors Rendel Harris, Ramsey, and others, would have something to say to him.

Codex D is undoubtedly eccentric (just as "*Sin.*" is colloquial), but it surely cannot be neglected, and even its interpolations are often valuable, and some few are quite possibly correct. If, therefore, "*Sin.*" supports it, D. does not indeed become conclusive, but what weight it has is increased. I did not mean more than this. A reading supported by D (Greek and Latin), the Pesh., Curetonian, and *Sin.* would, I think, be one that textual criticism would notice, though by no means necessarily accept.

YOUR REVIEWER.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ainger, Rev. Canon Alfred, M.A., Master of the Temple; Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty.

Allnutt, Rev. M. R., Vicar of All Hallows, Leeds; Vicar of St. Jude's, East Brixton.

Armstrong, Rev. B. J., M.A., Rector of Heydon; Secretary of the National Society for Ingworth Deanery (Northern Division).

Athill, Rev. G. J., M.A.; Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Hyde, Winchester.

Baker, Rev. Charles William Heathcote; Rector of St. Michael-at-Plea, Norwich.

Baldock, Rev. W. H.; Rector of Ashton St. Michael's, Northants.

Bambridge, Rev. Joseph John, C.M.S. Missionary at Kurrachee; Vicar of St. Mary Bredin, Canterbury.

Black, Rev. A. E., M.A., Vicar of Buxton; Secretary of the National Society for Ingworth Deanery (Southern Division).

Boulter, Rev. Edward Albert, B.A., Curate of Blessington and Kilbride, Diocese of Glendalough; Incumbent of Hollywood and Ballymore-Eustace, Diocese of Glendalough.

Coverley, Rev. Samuel Lee, B.A.; Rector of Pensthorpe, Norfolk, and Sole Charge of the Vicarage of Hempton and the Rectory of Pudding Norton, Norfolk.

Cowan, Rev. George Arthur; Rector of Caundle Purse, Dorsetshire.

Crosse, Ven. A. B., Canon Residentiary of Norwich Cathedral; Acting Chaplain 1st Cadet Battalion, Norfolk Regiment.

Dams, Rev. H.; Curate-in-Charge of St. Lawrence's Chapel-of-Ease, Morecambe.

Druitt, Rev. C., M.A., Vicar of Whitchurch Canonicorum; Secretary of the National Society for Bridport Deanery (Lyme Regis Portion).

Eck, Rev. H. V. S., Assistant-Chaplain; Chaplain of the Community of East London Diocesan Deaconesses.

Edwards, Rev. R. de Courcy, M.A., Curate of Lutterworth; Vicar of Lubenham, Leicestershire.

Ellison, Rev. John Henry Joshua, M.A., Vicar of Windsor; Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty.

Elwell, Rev. Henry Edward, B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.

Evans, Rev. F. P., B.A.; Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Derby.

Favell, Rev. H. A., M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Broomhall, Sheffield, and Prebendary of Wistow in York Minster; Archdeacon of Sheffield.

Fitchett, Rev. A. R.; Dean of Dunedin, New Zealand.

Fletcher, Rev. G. C., M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Lower Clapton; Sub-Warden of the Community of East London Diocesan Deaconesses.

Gaul, Rev. C. E., M.A., Curate of Crowan; Assistant-Inspector of Schools in Religious Knowledge.

Gill, Rev. E. Compton, Senior Mathematical Tutor and Assistant-Chaplain of St. Mark's College, Chelsea; Principal of the Diocesan Training College, Fishponds, Bristol.

Gough, Rev. E. J., M.A., Vicar of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and Honorary Canon of Newcastle Cathedral; Rural Dean of Newcastle.

Grensted, Rev. F. F., M.A., Second Master of Merchant Taylors' School, Great Crosby; Liverpool Diocesan Inspector of Schools.

Halley, Rev. Alexander Hay; Rector of Gussage St. Michael's Salisbury.

Hobbs, Rev. Francis Walter, B.A.; Rector of Landcross, Devonshire.

Jeffery, Rev. Edward J., M.A., Vicar of Frithelstock; Chaplain of Torrington Union.

Joynt, Rev. A. L.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of London.

Kennedy, Rev. Francis, Curate of Skelton-in-Cleveland; Vicar of Foston-on-the-Wolds, Driffield.

Knowles, Rev. Atherton, Curate of Bromley St. Leonard's; Vicar of St. James's, Ratcliff.

McClean, Rev. R., LL.D., Curate of St. John's, Sligo; Rector of Carnarvon, West Australia.

Manning, Rev. J.; Vicar of Eastdean, Sussex.

Merry, Rev. John William, M.A.; Rector of Buckland, Herts.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Fitch, Rev. Samuel Edward, M.D., Clerk in Holy Orders, at 12, Alma-square, Scarborough, on the 12th ult., aged 83.

Hobhouse, Ven. Reginald, over fifty years Rector of St. Ive, Cornwall, and for fourteen years Archdeacon of Bodmin, at St. Ive Rectory, on the 27th ult., aged 76.

Shilleto, Rev. John Hawtrey Richard, at the Vicarage, Unsworth, on the 15th ult., aged 57.

Turnock, Rev. James Robert, formerly Vicar of St. Mary-le-Tower, Ipswich, and Honorary Canon of Norwich, at Mentone, on the 20th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VICTORY OF GOODNESS.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, Honorary Canon of Manchester.

Sermon Preached at Yardley, near Birmingham, for the Bishop of Worcester's Church Extension Society, on Sunday, January 27th, 1895.

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." —Rom. xii. 21.

IT is with this weighty saying that St. Paul winds up that chapter of purest moral advice, the conclusion of which we read in the Epistle for to-day. He had been exhorting the Christians who were sojourning in the great world-metropolis of Rome not to let themselves be involved in the evil which was prevalent in that great city, and in the whole ancient world, of which it was the capital, far more than in any of our modern cities or in the modern world—above all, to shut out self, as their Master had done, from the motives which filled their hearts and actuated their lives; to exercise whatever gifts God had been pleased to give them to the utmost, not for self, but for other men; to be kind and loving to all, but especially to those who had been unkind and unjust to them; never to be led away from this good of theirs by any provocations or allurements of evil; and thus not to be conquered by evil, but to conquer evil by good.

I.—He thus expresses the most undoubting confidence in the power of goodness. For him it was a matter of absolute certainty that good is stronger than evil, truth than falsehood, or (to use the personifications which represented the case most vividly to his mind, as to ours) that Christ is stronger than the devil.

He held this conviction not only with regard to the great end towards which his whole life was directed, and which he pursued so eagerly, which was to win the world for Christ, and, through Him, for truth and goodness, but also with regard to every single means or expedient that he might adopt in furthering that end. He would never, in any case, do evil that good might come. He would not lie in the hope that, through the temporary falsehood, truth might eventually prevail; but he spoke, in every case, what seemed to him the truth, commending himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God, and he did, in every case, what seemed to him the right, regardless of the immediate effects which might follow from the right action. With him it was always, *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum;* let right be done, let truth be spoken, even if its speaker and its doer can only expect to fail, to suffer, or to die.

For he was confident that pure unselfishness and strict veracity are God's command and man's duty, whatever the earthly consequences may be, even if they seem to lead only to failure and martyrdom. And he was further cheered by this additional conviction, that truth and goodness are not destined to eventual failure, because unselfishness and veracity are stronger than any form of selfishness or of falsehood, so that certain victory is reserved for them at the end.

Thus he was an optimist, and happy in his optimism. Was it all an illusion—a dream? And was the striving life of effort and achievement, which was based upon this optimism, a mere instance of a man who walked in a vain shadow and disquieted himself in vain? Let us consider that question next. In other words, let us ask, Is it really true that good is stronger than evil, and truth than falsehood, even in this present world?

II.—We must not conceal from ourselves, that there is much in the world, as it actually exists, to discourage these optimistic views. We may note, on every side, and in all departments of life, apparent triumphs of evil over good, and of falsehood over truth.

In *war*, it was, I believe, the greatest general of modern times, the Emperor Napoleon, who said that, according to his experience, victory was wont to rest, not with the justest cause, but with the heaviest battalions. There, it is often the strong, and not the right, which prevails.

I hardly dare mention the world of *trade*, being ignorant of it myself, and speaking in the presence of many who must understand it thoroughly. Yet, looking upon it from a distance, with a mere outsider's view, it would sometimes appear, that it is not always the most honest tradesman, or the truest workman. or the best article, that wins success. Fortune would sometimes seem to fall into the hands of the boldest and luckiest speculator, or even into those of the least scrupulous self-advertiser.

In the world of *politics*, the statesman, if such an one anywhere exists, who trusts only to the intrinsic power of truth and goodness, who eschews all the arts of false rhetoric, who states his case with judicial impartiality precisely as it is, who carefully abstains from appealing to the selfishness of individuals or of classes, and only addresses himself to the higher motives of mankind—such an one would find himself neglected, like the Aristides of the Greeks, as an entirely unpractical politician, and doomed always to remain in a hopeless minority. Even the man who is most confident of his own rectitude and disinterestedness feels that he cannot conquer, unless he enlists the forces of evil on his side.

Or, if we look at *the religious world*, to which we of the Church belong, though we humbly trust that we are labouring for truth, for goodness, for Christ, for God; yet we cannot say that, even amongst us simple right, and truth, and goodness always prevail. The theologian is often merely the advocate of those views, which the circumstances of his life and worldly position compel him to maintain. The ecclesiastical judge is swayed and biassed by considerations of opportuneness or policy, which deflect his decisions from the straight path of simple right and truth. The ecclesiastical politician has all, and sometimes more than all, the arts of his secular brother, trusts like him in the power of organisation, and even in a baser thing—the power of money, conforms like him to the popular tastes, and appeals like him to the lower motives of mankind. And the preacher—this brings the matter closely home—the preacher cannot say that all his utterances have ever been a simple plea for truth and goodness, nor deny that he has sometimes been a mere rhetorician, like the political orator, whom perhaps he brands with the reproach of worldliness. Yet each of these is often successful for the time. Thus, even in the religious world, good does not always seem to win the immediate victory over evil, nor truth over falsehood.

There remains the world of *philanthropy*, to which not a few of the highest minds amongst us, observing that the religion of the day does not seem to trust only to the intrinsic power of the good and the true, are now exclusively devoting themselves, apart from all religious faith or profession. Many such are thinking—Amidst these philanthropic efforts, works can at least be done free from every tinge of selfishness, and words spoken which shall be perfectly sincere.

Yet such soon find that philanthropy is not all unmixed good; nor does the good attempted by it always win immediate success; it also has its sore discouragements.

If the philanthropist is sincere with himself, he confesses that he finds great difficulty in keeping his own motives pure. Equally with the religionist and the politician, he finds himself assaulted internally by all the countless forms of egotism. He cannot act upon the world without exhibiting himself to the world: and then, instead of (as His Master advised) his left hand not knowing what his right hand does, his philanthropic deeds are known to all the newspapers, and through them to all mankind.

And even if he does succeed in keeping his own motives entirely pure, he finds it very difficult to do good, without at the same time, doing equal or greater harm. Charity seems to degrade and demoralise its recipients, lowering, instead of elevating them, making them worse instead of better, less instead of more happy. At every step the philanthropist finds himself confronted by the mighty power of evil, and perhaps doubting whether good will ever conquer it.

It is amidst all these discouragements that the Apostle's word comes to us: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

III.—We are not going to give up our cause, or to say that the effort to which the Apostle invites us is a hopeless one; that evil is stronger than good, darkness than light, falsehood than truth, and, in a word, the devil than God. Difficulties may be great, discouragements frequent, failures more numerous than successes; but everyone who looks into his own heart can find a conviction seated there, as the deepest foundation of his own moral nature, that good is strongest, and will prevail. It was the most pessimistic writer of the Old Testament—that one who summed up all human life in the two words, vanity and vexation, *i.e.*, emptiness and disappointment—who nevertheless said: "Surely I *know* that it shall be well for them that fear God." That is the very thing that we also *know*—that it shall be well for them, both in the work that they do for themselves, and in that which they do for their brethren.

We cannot tell precisely how we know this—whether it is a deduction from admitted principles, or an induction from observed facts, or an intuition, or a Divine revelation—an unconscious prophecy, or what it may be; but we *do* know it. We know that goodness and truth are strongest. At every apparent triumph of evil in the world, we return into our own hearts, and there we find the conviction written indelibly on our consciences, that good will conquer in the end.

We may note for our encouragement, that he who expressed in our text the most undoubting confidence in the power and victory of goodness, had immediate experience of the truth of his own words. The career of St. Paul was one constant course of triumph. That is his own expression. "Thanks be to God," he said, "who always causeth us to triumph in Christ."

Looking back, as we do now, from a distance of more than eighteen centuries, on the work of Paul, and still more on that of the Master Whom he preached, no man can fail to see the greatness and reality of the victory. And it was won, with the feeblest instruments, against all the powers of this world, ecclesiastical as well as civil. And the force which gained it was nothing but goodness, nothing but truth.

That world into which the good news of Christ was first launched, was much more evil than our own contemporary world. Crimes were more enormous, vice more all-prevailing, all classes from the highest to the lowest more thoroughly demoralised than now. Yet the call to a higher, and purer, and therefore happier life, which was contained in Christ's Gospel, was welcomed in all countries, and especially in the most corrupt town populations, as soon as ever it was published.

The first victory of Christianity in the world was secured, before a priesthood arose to dominate its free religious life, before ecclesiastical statesmen appeared to give to it the powerful organisation which raised it eventually into one of the greatest earthly powers, before theologians arose to reduce its simple creed into a system of philosophical dogmas; long before the secular Government discovered that it could be converted into an useful ally, and at last dependent, of the State.

All the forces of the world were then against it, yet, in spite of them, it spread so fast that, when the first century had hardly closed, its sound had already gone out into all lands, and its words unto the ends of the world. No one knows precisely how it spread. For, with the single exception of the few fragments of St. Paul's life which the Acts of the Apostles contain, it has left behind it no history. After St. Paul's career was closed, no great missionary, who has left his mark upon the world, arose for several generations. No great writer, whose works have lived, appeared for half a century after the author of the Fourth Gospel. The era of commanding prelates, and of world-wide clerical organisation, was in the still more distant future. Yet, like the mustard plant, to which its Founder had compared it, it grew through its own inward principle of vitality, which was God's own Spirit, until it filled all the earth, and all who longed for truth and goodness came to shelter themselves amongst its branches. Like the seed dropped into the ground, the inhabitants of the world did not know how their great blessing came; they slept and wakened, and when they awoke, there was the tree of life growing amongst them, shedding its leaves for the healing of the nations. The sweet odour of Christ, to which St. Paul compares it, had breathed invisibly upon the winds, until it had filled all the air.

If we inquire, What was this mighty power which won so rapid and so complete a victory over the world? the answer is, Simply goodness. There is a venerable document, called the Doctrine or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, which has come down to us from the period when the last of those Twelve had only very recently left the world. This document contains the internal regulations of a single church or congregation, and thereby gives us a living picture of what such a single church was like, at the very time when our Faith was winning its first silent victory over the world. In it everything appears in germ or embryo, except one. The theology is undeveloped; the organisation is confined to the few officials who are absolutely necessary for any society to exist; the worship is the simplest possible. All else is merely in bud; but the purity of life, and the self-denying charity are flowers full-blown, or, rather let us say, are fruits matured. In it there are two ways presented between which men must choose—the way of vice and selfishness, which was the way of the world, and the way of Christ, which was purity and self-denying charity—in a word, the way of evil, and the way of good. And the noble and lovely figure of Christ is held forth as the Teacher and Exemplar of the way of good.

It was that way of good which conquered in the world by the intrinsic attractive charm of itself and of its Author. I believe that history bears witness that it always has conquered, and it is no presumption to prophesy that it always will conquer, whenever and wherever men have had faith to trust in it alone. Goodness is the strongest of all the evidences, whether of Christianity in general, or of any particular Christian body, or of any individual teacher; and it is the only evidence which can be appreciated equally by all mankind. Where men see good works, there they acknowledge the presence and the working hand of the Father who is in heaven. Or, as St. Paul himself expressed the same truth, goodness is a commendatory epistle, written by Christ Himself upon men's hearts and lives, which can be known and read by all men.

IV.—We must now attempt to apply the Apostle's lesson to the subject which we have immediately in hand.

If your Church Extension movement is, according to the Apostle's or according to his greater Master's mind, it is an effort to overcome the evils which exist in the neighbouring city, as in all other great cities. There is no need to recite or picture, still less to exaggerate, these evils. We all know that in every great town there is a vast amount of low, degraded life, intemperance, unchastity, ungodliness, and that there is much in the material condition of the people which tends to make vice very easy, and virtue very difficult, and in some cases almost impossible. We also know that even country life is not without its sins and shame.

Be persuaded, to begin with, that these evils are conquerable by the power of good. Be convinced, as St. Paul was, that even in this present world good is stronger than evil, truth than falsehood, Christ than the devil. Even if at times appearances seem to point the other way, hold that conviction by a strong inward effort of faith, for no good work is possible in the world without it.

Then let each see that he bears his own part in this noble work. It is not permitted to any one to withdraw or decline. If the only part that one can take in it is by giving, his gifts ought to be very liberal. But personal service is better far. Every one has his gift, which he must exercise, every one his opportunities of influence.

And never let any one forget that the power that can conquer evil is simply good. Nothing else can do it. Therefore the first aim of every one of us should be to purify his own motives, so that his actions may be good from their inmost springs. We must set before us the motive of Christ, which was complete self-denial, entire dis-

interestedness, perfect charity. Let each of us seek nothing for himself, but aim in all things at the truest and highest good of those among whom he lives, and for whose benefit he gives and labours.

He must be thoughtful as well as self-denying, for charitable and even spiritual efforts often tend to degrade and demoralise those who are their objects or recipients. Let the noble art of doing good be thoroughly studied and carefully applied.

Then stretch out the hand of Christian fellowship to all, without exception, who are engaged in the same pursuit, whether they be coincident with us in doctrine, and members of the same communion, or not. All such are for us, not against us; or, let us rather say, for our Master, not against Him. Everyone who is striving to cast out the devil, whether in the shape of moral or of material evil, is really for Christ, the ideal of disinterestedness, the pattern of philanthropy, the incarnation of unselfish love. That unselfish Master recognises such as His own, even if His professed disciples, in their egotistic narrowness, reject and anathematise them, nay, even if they themselves, in their blindness, are unable to acknowledge Him.

As the individual who would do good in the world must begin by striving to elevate and purify his own motives, so must the Church also begin her crusade against evil, by elevating and purifying her own. She must go to her work conscious of her many deficiencies, and never seek to praise, or magnify, or glorify herself. The farther she puts away from herself all designs of self-interest, and all words of self-praise, the greater will be her saving influence on the world. Let it be seen that she exists, and labours not for herself, but for those, to save whom from sin and misery her Master laboured and died, and men will see her good works, and glorify her heavenly Founder. Let us seek for our Church, not worldly power, nor worldly splendour, but simply and solely the palm of perfect disinterestedness, and all-embracing charity. Not splendid buildings nor gorgeous ceremonial, but good, simply and humbly done to the bodies and souls of men, is the Church's true ornament, and the foundation of all her saving influence. When decked and adorned with these, she will indeed deserve the name, which two Scripture writers give her, of the Bride of Christ. A Church, seeking not her own, glorifying not herself, but striving humbly to be rich in all good works, would realise both the pictures which those two writers trace, being without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, and clothed in white linen pure and clean, her purity consisting in the righteousness, not of her dead saints only, but of her living ones.

When there exists on earth a Church like this, perfect in her disinterestedness, fearless in her truthfulness, universal in her charity, she will not be lacking in influence, nor complain of want of success. Good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over, will men pour into her bosom. The freshness of her morning dawn will then return; her sound will go forth into all lands; the odour of Christ that rises from her will breathe far and wide; her tree of life will grow, like a plant, from its own inward vitality. And all this simply and solely because she will have then believed, and have had courage to act on her belief, that good is stronger than evil, that all evil can and will be overcome by good—pure, unmixed, unadulterated good.

ROBERT BRUCE'S PERSEVERANCE.

By the Very Rev. G. GRANVILLE BRADLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

Preached at the Children's Service, in Westminster Abbey, on Holy Innocents' Day, Friday, December 28th, 1894.

"Let us not be weary in well-doing."—Gal. vi. 9.

MY dear children, let me first of all remind you that it was on this day, more than eight hundred years ago, that the great Abbey Church of Westminster was solemnly dedicated to the worship of our Father which is in heaven. It is, then, if we like to call it so, the birthday of this great church. And it is also the day on which we keep the memory of those little children, younger than you, mere babes—Holy Innocents we call them—who were massacred at Bethlehem. It is their death-day, or rather, as we love to think, their birthday into a brighter world, whither He, for whose sake they were put to death, was to follow; to return home from whence He came even by a more cruel death than theirs. And now, having said this, let me tell you the meaning of the text I have chosen, the one lesson I should like you to carry home to-day. "Let us not," says the Apostle Paul, "let us not be weary in well-doing." He says, that is, to us, and to each one of you, do not easily give up, but do your very utmost, each one of you, in trying again and again to do, and to say, and to think what you know to be right, and in trying hard not to do, not to say, not to think what you know to be wrong; do not be tired or easily disheartened because you often, very often perhaps, find it hard to please those who love you by resisting evil temper, or idleness, or selfishness, or any of the bad ways into which you find it so easy to slip; but try to go manfully up the Hill Difficulty, of which you have, perhaps, heard or read in the story of Christian in the "Pilgrim's Progress." It is a hill, my dear children, which, young or old, we must all climb if we would ever reach or enter the Palace Beautiful, or a better place even than that.

In former years I have often chosen, for our example and yours, stories taken from the lives of

those who were buried in the tombs of this Abbey many hundred years ago. To-day I shall ask you to listen to a story which any of your older friends might tell you who were showing you some of the graves of those who have been laid to rest here within times which they themselves can well remember, or at whose funerals, perhaps, they themselves were present. It is the story of a Scottish king who lived nearly six hundred years ago, and who, if he had come to Westminster then would most certainly have been put to a cruel death as a rebel, and his body not buried here beneath some stately tomb, not buried anywhere, but exposed in hideous fashion to frighten and terrify his friends. But now, though the body of Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, lies far away in Scotland, you may see more than one of the stories of his life told or just hinted at in the painted window placed over the grave of the lady whose memory is still exceedingly honoured here. She bore the name and was descended from the Robert Bruce of whom I am going to speak. She bore the name Augusta Bruce, a dear and cherished friend of her Queen and ours, until she became the wife of the much-honoured Dean who first began these services of Innocents' Day; and when her death plunged him in grief he raised a window of coloured glass above her grave, in each different portion of which there is something painted to remind us either of her ancestors or of her family or of her own good and Christian work among the sick, poor, and suffering; and if ever you are taken by those who know this Abbey into what is called the chapel of King Henry VII., you will pass the tomb of that king himself, about whom and those buried in the same grave much might be told you; and just beyond you will see the tomb and effigy of him of whom I have just spoken—this lady's husband, Arthur Stanley, long the honoured Dean of this Abbey. And if you look as you stand there, downwards, you will see a gravestone, often, very often, with fresh wreaths or simple flowers lying upon it; and beneath it lie two coffins, one that of his wife of whom I spoke. Then, if you will look up at the window of which I spoke before, you will see in quite the highest part, if you will look carefully, a picture of a spider's web in the left-hand corner at the very top. What, you may well ask, has a spider's web to do with Westminster Abbey, or with those who are buried here; or why should we come to church to-day to listen to a story about a spider?

Let me tell you the story; it is a very interesting one in itself, and you will see, I think, why I tell it to you to-day. It comes down to us from the days of King Edward I., of England, whose tomb, perhaps, some of you have seen in the Chapel of King Edward the Confessor, after whom he was named by his father. No two kings in the whole world could be more unlike than these two Edwards—the one, round whose lofty shrine all those warrior kings and famous queens lie, was the most child-like and beautiful of kings; and the other was the great statesman, and the great soldier, and the pitiless conqueror first of Wales and then of Scotland—Edward I. He it was who brought here the famous coronation stone on which the Scottish kings had been crowned, and on which every king and queen has been seated at their coronation from that day to this. He had already put the Scotchman, Sir William Wallace, to a traitor's death after a trial—if trial we can call that mock trial close by in Westminster Hall—and had his body cut to pieces and exposed in ghastly fashion on spikes on London Bridge. But the task of conquering Scotland was a very hard one even for that great soldier; and the leader of those Scottish rebels and traitors, as King Edward called them, was Robert Bruce, of whose hairbreadth escapes and desperate adventures you will find a charming account in Sir Walter Scott's "Tales of a Grandfather," a book written nearly seventy years ago, and read in their childhood by many who are now grandfathers having grandchildren of their own. And this Robert Bruce was the bravest of soldiers and most formidable of fighters. Few men could use his sword; few faced him in fight.

But the task of driving the English invaders seemed far too hard for him. Even among the Scottish nobles he had many foes, and though he had been crowned King of Scotland his cause seemed at last quite lost. He had to part from the Queen his wife, he had to part from friends and supporters, and at last leave Scotland and take refuge in lands lying off the coast of Ireland; and there there came to him the terrible news that his wife had been taken prisoner, and the noble lady who accompanied her, and who had placed the crown on his own head, was also captive, shut up like a wild beast in a cage, and his youngest and much-loved brother, Nigel Bruce, had been put to a terrible death as a traitor. All seemed lost. The only course left open to him seemed to be to give up Scotland, give up his crown, and to try and make his way to the Holy Land, where Jesus came with the message of peace on earth, and try to atone—such was the idea of those days—try to atone for the sins and faults of his past life by fighting against the Saracens, and endeavour to drive them out of the place where Jesus once walked and taught. And as he lay on the miserable crib in the unswept cabin, his eye was caught by something he saw above him. It was a spider hanging on a thread which it had spun, as spiders do, from its own body, and trying to swing itself to another beam from that on which it had fixed its thread, and so to reach a foundation on which it could weave its web. And he saw the spider try and try again, yet try in vain, and he thought of his own vain efforts to overcome those English conquerors, and to win freedom for Scotland; and poor downhearted Bruce could not take his eyes off the spider; and six times he saw

the poor insect fail, and he remembered, with a sigh, the six fights in which he had striven in vain against his own foes; and he thought the spider seemed as tired and as beaten in his trials as he had been himself. But he watched and watched; and he saw it still persevere, gathering up its strength and preparing for one more attempt. Then Bruce said to himself, "If the spider fails this time, I will take it as a sign that I will fail too, and I will give up hopes and go back to Scotland never more." Had this happened, the history of Scotland and England might have been much changed. But the spider did not fail in this seventh attempt, but swung itself across and reached the beam at which it aimed, and made fast its thread, and was now free to run across backwards and forwards and spin its web as it wished. And Bruce took heart. The story seemed to him a sign from heaven of encouragement and cheer; and he, too, persevered, and instead of giving up and going away to die fighting Saracens, he went back to Scotland, and tried yet again and again, till at last, after the death of King Edward I., he won that great victory at Bannockburn, and became not in name only, but in reality, the ruler and acknowledged King of Scotland. And the day came when one of his descendants arrived in England to be crowned as King of England and Scotland in this very Abbey, and now lies buried only a few feet from that picture of the spider. And our Queen, and her children, and her children's children are all descended from that very Robert Bruce whom another of her ancestors, Edward I., would most certainly have put to a terrible death could he have laid hands upon him.

I do not think that in any other church, my dear children, I should have chosen this story as a kind of parable to encourage young children to persevere, persevere, persevere; but it came into my mind not many days ago, as I stood by the grave of Dean Stanley, and looked up to the window above; and I remembered those distant days in which, as a child myself, I read the story of Bruce and Douglas. And why do I tell it to you to-day? You to whom I speak will never be called upon to fight nor win for yourself a crown; but you will see something of what the lesson teaches. You may one day, to-day, to-morrow, any day, be trying to do something that is very hard to do; you may one day or another have to fight with enemies of quite a different kind from those who so nearly drove Bruce to despair, but whom he at last quite overcame. You have tried, perhaps, or will try in vain, to overcome some fault, or to do well something which you feel you ought to do, and yet find very hard to do, and you are vexed, or will have vexed those whom you ought not to vex, and you will have grieved the Holy Spirit, who speaks to you and to all and every one of you in your conscience, and you feel weary of trying and failing. It is of no use, you say, I shall never cure myself of this, or, I will never be able to do that; I will give it up, and try no more.

My dear children, when this thought comes to you, as come it may, think not only of our text, but also of the words which follow it, "Let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not"; but think also of that old, old story which has come down to us from 600 years ago, and try in another way to do as Bruce did then, and resolve to try again, and not lose heart even if you have failed six times or six times six. Ask in your prayers for help to persevere.

I was going to tell you another story, indeed I had thought of one or two more, one from the early days of the great missionary and explorer Livingstone, over whose gravestone the clergy and the choir pass daily in procession as we come to service here or pass away from service; and another from the life of the Swedish songstress of whom some of you have heard, and whose memorial tablet was the last that has been placed on our walls. But one such story is enough, and the story of Robert Bruce is now known far and wide, and his name is held in honour alike in Scotland and England and in lands that were then quite unknown to Scotchmen or to Englishmen. Even now, one of his name and lineage (and not the first of them) has been sent to govern India as Viceroy of our Queen. But for yourselves what shall I say? You will not win honour through distant ages and in other lands because you fight to overcome something you know is evil, or to do something you know is right. But if you succeed you will win favour not only of friends and parents, here, but of our Father in heaven who sees all the secrets of our hearts. It was not only to grown-up disciples that the words of Christ Himself were spoken; and even quite young children may and sometimes do perform very noble actions, and give up all, everything, even life itself, for the sake of others. It was only this last summer that in one of our great London hospitals lay the body of a little boy ten years old who met his death by drowning. He had seen another little boy, still younger than himself, wading along the shallow edge of the Thames, suddenly step into deep water, and heard his cry for help; and this little boy of ten years of age, with no one else to help, saved him, and brought him to land; and then, overtired, I suppose, with the great effort he had made, slipped from off the raft which they had reached, and was washed by the tide into deep water under a steamboat and drowned, drowned before the eyes of the little lad he had saved and of a man who hurried up—too late, however, to save him, but who told what he had seen. Now no one will celebrate or tell to future ages that story. I owed my own knowledge of it to a slip cut from a newspaper and sent me six months ago by one who had lost by death, many years ago, her only

and much-loved little boy. Yet we feel one and all that we honour that brave child, because a voice within tells us that he did a deed and died a death which must be dear to Him who laid down His life for us. No one will give you a great reward, perhaps none at all, for striving and striving to conquer some evil or to do some good which cost you many efforts and failure to conquer or to do. No nation will pay you the honour which Scotland and England paid to that Robert Bruce. But every such effort will be dear to Him to whose service you were dedicated as unconscious babes, and you will be aided by Him if you seek His aid; and you will win at last—be sure you will with His help—the battle against your enemies. And may God's blessing be largely given you, and may you and yours learn through many Christmas seasons fresh lessons from the teaching of Jesus Christ to His disciples, and from the lessons which we may so often learn from the lives of those who have gone before, whether lately or long ago, to the world which lies beyond the grave.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—The Hope of the Righteous. "The righteous hath hope in his death" (Prov. xiv. 32). Introduction.—We have here a plain declaration by a wise man under the guidance of Divine inspiration. It is a culminating result and characteristic of the people of God. There is only one class of people mentioned in our text, viz., the "righteous"—the people of God. There are but two classes recognised in their relationship to God in Holy Scripture, those that follow Him and those that follow Satan. Of course, all by creation are of one common Creator. There are many examples in Holy Scripture of those who did the Lord's will and those who did not. We have examples and portraits of each demonstrated in the Bible. How important it is that we examine ourselves and ask ourselves the question, How am I living? Whither am I going? What is the purpose of my existence? These questions are infinitely important to every one, and should be pondered and considered now: "This is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation." The purpose of our lives in this mortal state, this state of probation and discipline, is to prepare us for an existence that can never be snuffed out, since we are destined for an immortal state—a state in which we may enjoy never-ending joy. How essential that we consider how to be ready in order to enter upon an existence which knows no end. There are multitudes who are rushing on in this sublunary state without giving this question, the greatest of all questions, the slightest consideration. The righteous, nevertheless, hath hope in his death; he knows that, when his end comes, he only takes his final plunge in the dark river, only a little distance to go through the dark valley. But Jesus is with him and escorts him safely home on the other side, where bursts the full effulgence of heavenly ecstasy. We may learn a few lessons from our text:—1. The righteous are guided by God. 2. The righteous are journeying on the right road. 3. The righteous are watched by God. 4. The righteous have hope and faith in God. 5. The righteous hath joy and hope in his death.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1895.

THE DECLINE OF DISSENT.

OVER-GREAT importance must not be attached to the words of a beaten man in the moment of humiliation. Perhaps that is why Mr. Impey's remarks in the *Westminster Gazette*, on the reasons of his defeat at Evesham, have attracted so little notice. But it is singular that, from any motive, the defeated Radical candidate should have complained of the decline of Dissent.

It has long been evident, in England, that Dissent has practically abandoned some fields in which it once laboured. A generation ago it was strong in the country; now rural Dissent has almost died out; the number of purely country parishes in which a dissenting place of worship and ministry is regularly kept up is very small. This is an evil. No doubt, in many cases, the descendants of the quondam Dissenters have returned to the true fold; in many others, unhappily, Dissent has degenerated into indifference. This is bad. These are times when we have need of all the religious influences that may be brought to bear. The ministers of the Church are more than ever required to be vigilant in their office when others abandon the posts which they have arbitrarily assumed.

In the poorer parts of towns, also, Dissent has practically left the field. It seems not to appeal to the poor. This can hardly be through want of means. In religious things the poor are comparatively more generous than the rich. The Church is nobly trying to do her duty among them, and they respond. Still there are masses of people almost untouched by any spiritual influence; the Church has hardly yet succeeded in reaching them, and Dissent leaves them severely alone.

But has Dissent declined among the fairly, or more than fairly, prosperous trading classes? The question has three issues, bearing upon Dissent as an institution or "going concern," as a force in religion, and as a force in politics. As a going concern Dissent, though it does not gain ground, can scarcely be said to be on the decline. The "residential" quarters of the towns have numerous Dissenting places of worship, with a fully organised and, in their own line, efficient ministry, which seems well supported; the endowments of Dissent are considerable, and the revenue from seat-rents, etc., must be large. The "chapel" still fills a large place in the life of the trading classes. And yet its functions have entirely altered. Along with the ornaments, inside and out, which were once taboo to the old school of Dissenters, has come a change in the relations of the chapel to the congregation. It has become almost completely secularised. Religious services are not its only, or even its chief *raison d'être*. It is a hall for concerts and magic lantern lectures and social meetings. The writer has experience of three large Wesleyan and Primitive Methodist chapels (they call them "churches" now) which are, in fact, little else than public halls. They are employed for all kinds of public purposes, admission tickets are sold in the stationers' and music shops, the buildings are lent, and even hired, and the institutions depend far more upon these sources of income than upon those more strictly religious. It should be added that the religious services are also largely for entertainment, being often of the nature of Sunday concerts. They are advertised by posters, handbills, and programmes, "popular favourites" (*sic*) are engaged, under such titles as "Song-Evangelist," etc. Often performances are rendered by one or more persons, solos and duets, with the help of an orchestra (duly advertised), and the performers are announced to accompany themselves on the accordion, concertina, and so on. In fact the "service" is a variety entertainment, thinly disguised, without the untutored fervour and enthusiasm which redeems the vagaries of Salvation Army meetings and negro revivals.

Such proceedings have little more than a nominal connection with religion. They correspond with no religious needs. At best they can only serve to provide amusement and recreation, which might be obtained in other ways, and at other times, and not at the expense of the principle of public worship. Their religious influence, when not harmful, must be nil. Probably this is why Dissenters are indifferent to the secularising of the schools; since they have already secularised their chapels, they see no harm in it. They have allowed the dividing line between religion, and morality, and self-culture to fade almost out. Their hold upon definite Christian doctrine is so loose that they are on the point of letting it slip altogether, and what they do not care to keep they do not care to teach. It would be hard to name any single article of the Christian faith which any modern Dissenting body would claim as vital. When that attitude is contrasted with the intense devotion to certain aspects of Christian truth in which Dissent originated, it must be admitted that Dissent, as a religious force, is sadly on the decline.

Dissent, as a political force, has shown some curious modern developments, summed up in that singular phrase, the "Nonconformist conscience." This is a euphemism to veil the fact that the religious organisation of Dissent has been, of late years, annexed to the political organisation of Gladstonianism. Perhaps the Gladstonians overvalued the support thus gained. Plainly, Mr. Impey has been disappointed in it. In any case the shattering of the idol must be attended by the dissipation of the force. Dissent has most certainly declined as a force in favour of Lord Rosebery and his jack-of-all-trades administration. It is also probable that it has declined as a political force absolutely. Persons connected with religion, even only in name, which is the case with many Dissenting ministers, had better keep aloof from politics. Loss of influence must otherwise result. The Roman Catholics seem likely to experience this in Ireland, and the Dissenters have anticipated their experiences.

These changes in the status and influence of Dissent are serious, though not unforeseen. Mr. Spurgeon warned his fellows of them over and over again. He clearly foretold the tendencies of the "Down-grade." They are now in full swing. What the consequences will be remains to be seen. Dissent may never recover from them. It is to be hoped that an inclination to follow their steps, noticeable in a few Churchmen, will not gain ground. The business of the Church is to profit by the warning, and steadily eschew the temptations to laxity, latitudinarianism and self-interest, which have contributed to the decline of Dissent, and may ultimately bring about its fall.

CHURCH SCHOOLS.

MR. ACLAND has not hesitated to show his preference for the Board School system, and this bias, on the part of one appointed to administer with impartiality the laws governing Elementary Education, has—it is to be hoped, unintentionally—resulted in very numerous cases of hardship to Church Schools throughout the country during the last two years. Speaking at Preston, in October, 1893, with reference to Government Departments, Lord Salisbury said:—"Parliament has made these bureaucracies within certain limits absolutely despotic, and it has trusted to good feeling, and the probability that they might be restrained in time, that these powers might not be

misused." These wholesome traditions have been thrown over by Mr. Acland, and high-handed, vexatious interference has been the order of the day. In short, the word "may" has been read as "must" in the Acts under which the Education Department exercises its powers. Hence the complaints of clergy and school managers from every diocese, and well nigh every rural deanery, of arbitrary demands, inconsiderately pressed, at a time of unusual commercial and agricultural depression, and of utterly inadequate periods allowed for collecting the additional funds required for their execution. Many cases, in which the action of the Department adversely affected Church schools, were made the subject of questions in the House of Commons last Session, by members of the Christian Education Parliamentary Committee, and in not a few instances, as a reference to *Hansard* will show, the grievances complained of were, under Parliamentary pressure, admitted, and the demands were modified or withdrawn. There is, however, reason to fear that during the recess the screw has again been applied, and it is evident that nothing short of the continuous pressure of public opinion, operating through Parliament and the Press, will prevent unreasonable demands and tyrannical action. The following statement, taken from the report of the Secretary of a Diocesan Education Society, shows the increasing demands made on Church schools:—"The pressure on us is abnormal: in 1891, 14 schools applied for assistance from the Society; in 1892 (the year of the change of Government), 22; in 1893, 44; and for the five months ending May 31st, 1894, no less than 31." In one archdeaconry alone in a northern diocese, an aggregate expenditure of over £25,000 had to be incurred in 50 schools, mainly owing to the demands of the Department. Instances might be multiplied, but enough has been said to show the necessity for closely watching the action of the Department. Mr. Acland need not anticipate hostile criticism from the Church party in the House or in the country in the exercise of the powers conferred upon him for remedying any proved defects in the machinery of education, whether as regards the sanitation, the plant, or the teaching power of voluntary schools, but he will encounter the resolute opposition of Churchmen whenever he strains those powers by applying them with unintelligent rigidity to the varying conditions of schools, whether rural or urban, or uses them as an engine of oppression to gratify the rancour of the Secularist and the Sectarian.

The report upon this subject, recently issued by the committee appointed by the two Archbishops, upon the condition and prospects of voluntary schools, is very interesting reading, and conveys a world of meaning for Churchmen. They have presented a report which has secured the almost unanimous approval of Churchmen, and throughout the country the Church press ha been practically unanimous in agreeing with the proposals submitted. The report insists upon a fact too often forgotten, viz., that the future of the voluntary schools is a subject upon which the ratepayer is very deeply concerned. To close those schools would throw upon the rates the cost of building other schools to take their place, and of furnishing them, as well as the cost of maintenance. Thus the opponent of the voluntary schools is really a person who wishes to put into practice, at the expense of the ratepayers, a theory that no public elementary education should in any way be organised or controlled by private persons. In the meantime, however, free education, bad times, and the rigorous requirements of the Education Department have made it hard for some Church schools to pay their way. How are they to be kept at work in the interests of the community? That is the urgent question just now. The report of the committee approaches the problem in a practical way. The first essential is that Churchmen should help their own schools. To drop subscriptions, or to leave the schools weak for want of such aid, is merely to play into the enemy's hands. Too often it seems to be thought that the schools need only be the care of a few well-to-do parishioners; but parents of scholars, and members of the congregation in general, can, in combination, render help quite as effective. It is sometimes a little painful to reflect on the ease with which subscriptions, large and small, are obtained for missionary work where nothing is offered for the support of the schools. After all, much may be lost from want of asking, and, when the clergy set themselves to interest their people at large in the subject, they may be met with more general sympathy than is at present manifest. More general aid is, at all events, the immediate duty, for the need is urgent, and legislation cannot be looked for at once. When, however, it is possible, then the report suggests a new policy for Churchmen. They are to ask that all schools, Board Schools and Voluntary Schools alike, should receive from Imperial funds a maintenance grant equal to the sum necessary for the payment of their teachers. The details of such a grant remain, of course, for settlement, but the principle is at once simple, convenient, and likely to secure the sympathy of teachers and parents, as well as of school managers. Upon the realisation of this proposal Churchmen must be prepared to concentrate their forces.

"RAVENSHOE," by Henry Kingsley.—A new edition of this interesting and eventful tale has been published by Ward, Lock & Bowden. It is in a cheap form, but is very well got up, and has a frontispiece by R. Caton Woodville. We commend it to the notice of our readers, as well as to that of the managers of all public libraries.

CHURCH NOTES.

AMONG the appointments to London benefices last week, it may be noted that the Archbishop of Canterbury has conferred upon the Rev. Arthur Carr, Vicar of St. Sebastian, Wokingham, the living of Addington, vacant by the preferment of the Rev. J. A. Reeve to the Rectory of Lambeth. The Rev. R. B. Ransford is to be succeeded in the Vicarage of St. Jude's, East Brixton, by the Rev. M. R. Allnutt, Vicar of All Hallows, Leeds, who, by a curious coincidence, was at one time Curate of St. Paul's, Upper Norwood, the church of which Mr. Ransford has just been appointed Vicar.

Old Rugbeians of "the Doctor's" time will read with interest "Tom Brown's" estimate of the late Mr. Septimus Hansard, who was one of his schoolfellows, which has just been published. Judge Hughes gives an interesting account of his old friend's work as a curate under John Hampden Gurney in Lisson Grove. There was a bad outbreak of smallpox in the parish, and a scare about infection from cabs which took patients to the hospital. Hansard caught it badly by the bedside of a poor parishioner, and insisted on being taken to the hospital in the hearse of a neighbouring undertaker, by way of at once allaying the scare and setting a good example. Judge Hughes adds, "I can truly say that, in my long and varied experience, I have never met a servant of Christ of whom I could say so confidently that 'he feared God with all his heart, and neither man or devil beside,' as was said of his loved master, Arnold."

By a curious coincidence, Mr. Hansard's death has been quickly followed by that of the Rev. Bryan King, whose place he supplied for a time at St. George's-in-the-East, after the anti-Ritual riots there. Mr. King became Vicar of Avebury, in Wilts, after resigning his London cure, and has held the office for more than thirty years. He never, we believe. had any trouble with his rural parishioners. Mr. King, who was over 80 years of age, died on the 30th of January.

Nearly £2,000 has been subscribed to perpetuate the memory of Archdeacon Blakeney. the late vicar of Sheffield, but we do not yet hear what form the proposed memorial is to take. No appointment has yet been made to the vicarage, but the Archbishop of York has conferred the vacant archdeaconry upon Canon Favell, vicar of St. Mark's, Sheffield, who is said to be an excellent preacher. He is, moreover, a decided Evangelical, and as Sheffield Churchmanship is mainly of that type, his appointment has given much satisfaction.

It is officially announced that the Subjects Committee of the Norwich Church Congress invite the proposal of subjects, to be sent to the honorary secretary, the Ven. Archdeacon Nevill, The Close, Norwich, on or before Saturday, February 9th. After that date none can be accepted.

Two articles in the *Nineteenth Century* for this month have especial interest for Churchmen. In the first Canon Carter states and defends what he holds to be the position of the Church of England as regards Auricular Confession, against Canon Teignmouth Shore's paper on the subject published a month ago. Mr. Carter does not succeed in showing that his antagonist was wrong in the deduction which he drew from the discrepancy between the First and Second Prayer-books of Edward VI. and other considerations, that the Reformed Church of England, rightly or wrongly, sanctions confession only in special cases, and discountenances its practice as a rule. He does not, indeed, himself recommend the practice by all and at all times, and if its advocates had not gone much farther in their teaching than he does in the present article, no controversy need have arisen. Few instructed Churchmen deny that Confession is permitted by the Church, or that in some cases it may be used with advantage.

There is a good deal of hard hitting, as might be expected, in Lord Grimthorpe's paper on "Marriage of Innocent Divorcees." We all know that the Chancellor of York does not love Bishops, and that the recent action of the Archbishop of York has not improved the relations between them. We are not going to be rash enough to express an opinion as to the rights and wrongs of the knotty point which has been raised, but Lord Grimthorpe does undoubtedly make out a strong case against the view that divorce is absolutely forbidden in the New Testament. It has perhaps not escaped Lord Grimthorpe's notice that, according to the Registrar-General's annual report, the remarriage of divorced persons appears to be decidedly on the increase.

A correspondent, signing himself "Catholicus," writes to the *Glasgow Herald*, announcing as "pleasant" news that he has heard a Presbyterian minister repeat the Creed and pray for the dead, also that the minister expressed himself to the effect that he was a Catholic first, and a Presbyterian second. The minister would have had a bad time with his brethren not so long ago, but if, as is to be supposed, he belongs to the Established Church of Scotland, it is more than probable that he will not be brought to book. What are called in England Catholic principles have made such progress in the Auld Kirk of late that even prayers for the departed would not in some places excite much controversy.

The Protestant Nonconformist ministers in Ireland are signing an address to the Archbishop of Dublin expressing their thankfulness to him for his consecration of a Spanish Bishop. In the course of it they say that they have been struck by the spontaneity of the Reform movement in Spain. They are convinced that it is not the fruit of foreign propaganda, but the logical result of men thinking for themselves on the Papal system.

The Pope is determined to pose as the champion of Reunion of the Churches, though in the opinion of most Englishmen he is the greatest obstacle to it. Reports from various sources go to confirm the statement that Leo XIII. will not accept Cardinal Vaughan's assurance that the Church of England is not ready for absorption. He wants other opinions before he gives up his hope, and that is the reason why several English Roman Catholic Bishops have been summoned to Rome. The Pope's illusion is doubtless a pleasant one, but it will have to be rudely dissipated.

The *Church Musician* tells a pleasant little story The Congregationalists of Hodnet having made a bid for the old organ in the Parish Church, were agreeably

surprised to get a letter from the vicar offering it to them as a gift.

A yet more striking illustration of kindly Christian co-operation in good work is mentioned in *Life and Work*, the journal of the Scotch Mission at Blantyre, in Zambesia. The paper says:—"A set of Communion vessels, for use in travelling, has been given to us through the great kindness of the Universities' Mission. It is but right to say that, while they gave us the means, the choice of the gift was our own. By no people have we been treated with such cordial friendship, such unstinted recognition of our labours, and such generous silence and forbearance upon points of doctrine in which conscience must command them to differ from us, as by our brethren in the Universities' Mission."

A further appeal is being issued for funds to complete the decoration of St. Paul's Cathedral. Among the latest donations announced is one of £1,000 from Lord Iveagh. The total amount now subscribed is about £18,000.

It is always interesting to have the opinion of literary authorities upon hymns. A little while ago we learned that, in the judgment of Mathew Arnold, the finest hymn in the English language is "When I survey the wondrous cross." There is an article in the *Century*, which tells us what was thought on the subject by Oliver Wendell Holmes. "There are very few modern hymns," said the Autocrat on one occasion, "which have the old ring of saintliness in them. Sometimes when I am disinclined to listen to the preacher at church, I turn to the hymn-book, and when one strikes my eye I cover the name at the bottom, and guess. It is almost invariably Watts or Wesley; after those, there are very few which are good for much."

Zeal without knowledge. The new incumbent of —— read himself in, and next day a prominent member of the congregation sent in her parish books and keys, with the intimation that she was giving up her seat and work in the parish. On inquiry he found that it was his reading of the Thirty-nine Articles which had kindled her wrath. She left the church in hysterics, delaring that she would never enter the church again where such Popery went on. "Peter Lombard," in the *Church Times*, is the authority for the story.

The income of the East London Church Fund for 1894, which has now been ascertained, amounted to £18,797, an excess of £400 over the income in 1893, the highest figure on record. The Council are thus able to begin the year free of debt, and with the hope of maintaining their present work undiminished. We are sorry to hear, however, that this result has only been obtained by a large reduction in grants effected last year, and a rigid refusal of new applications. Twenty thousand pounds is the minimum needed to do the yearly work of the fund.

The Missions to Seamen has voted £100 to the Rev. Harry Morgan, of Darling Point, Sydney, and appointed him chaplain to the merchant seamen in Sydney Harbour. Hitherto, although men-of-war's men have been duly cared for in that part of the world, no spiritual provision has been made for the 25,000 merchant seamen and firemen who frequent the harbour every year.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CONFORMITY AND NONCONFORMITY.

SIR,—The letter signed Edmund Lawrence, published in your issue of the 2nd inst., I do not consider to be a clear statement to direct us all into a knowledge of true religion. I quote the following from his letter, "The Scriptures teach, if I understand them rightly, that the Church is a society founded on the Day of Pentecost, of which society all persons baptised are members." Now this quotation I do not consider makes a clear distinction between the Church and its members. The Church I take to be the plan which God ordained after the fall of our first parents in the Garden of Eden, and the members of the Church are those who are sincerely desirous to conform to the teaching of that plan. St. Paul preached the Word of God as the way of salvation.

Then why should we not as a people rejoice in aiding our rulers in maintaining a knowledge of God's Word as the only right rule of faith? What other conclusion then can we come to, but that an alien Church is one that opposes rulers in their endeavour to have God's Word orderly proclaimed in the nation? The most logical position for a people to be in with a view to their good is to be subject to God's righteous and holy will; any deviation from this must make their condition more or less illogical, as regards their choosing the good and refusing the evil. St. Paul well understood all this when he wrote the words at 1 Cor. i. 10: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; and that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

What can bring a greater blessing on a people than by their exercise of a humble spirit to be subject to good authority? I feel I shall do well in concluding with the words recorded at 1 Peter ii. 17, "Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king." J. T. DOCKER.

Worthing, February, 1895.

SIR,—Mr. Lawrence has these two statements in his letter of January 28th: (1) "The Scriptures teach, if I understand them rightly (why rightly?), that the Church is a society, founded on the Day of Pentecost, of which society all baptised persons are members." (2) "Evangelicalism (!), as I understand it, teaches that the Church consists of converted persons." It will be enough, for the present, if Mr. Lawrence will devote himself to the proof of the first of his two statements. The latter may stand aside as unimportant. We need not be concerned with what any "its" teach, even though the "it" be Evangelicalism. We do need to know what God teaches in His Word. "Was steht in der Bibel geschrieben, müssen wir alle halten." It is important that we teach what is written, and not what we think ought to be written. "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Will Mr. Lawrence kindly tell us those passages in the Scriptures which teach what he says, either (1) directly or (2) indirectly? J. P. SANDLANDS.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Abud, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rural Dean, Vicar of Uttoxeter; Prebendary of Bobenhall in Lichfield Cathedral.
Adams, Rev. James, Rector of Kill; Rural Dean of Naas.
Alderson, Rev. H. E., M.A., Vicar of Peel; Hon. R.D.S. for the Church Army in the Deanery of Bolton, Manchester.
Atkins, Rev. L. White, Vicar of Holy Rood, Southampton; Chaplain of the Almshouses in this Parish, called "God's House."
Baker, Rev. Stanley, Curate and Assistant-Master of St. Michael's College, Tenbury; Chaplain of Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford.
Bellhouse, Rev. Louis Arthur, M.A.; Vicar of Whittle-le-Woods, Chorley.
Berryman, Rev. Charles Powell, M.A.; Vicar of York Town, Camberley, Surrey.
Billington, Rev. Charles, M.A.; Vicar of St. Oswald's, Knuzden, Accrington.
Bolton, Rev. C. N., M.A., Vicar-Designate of St. Mary's, Lichfield; Prebendary of Dassett Parva in Lichfield Cathedral.
Bonney, Rev. A., M.A., Vicar of Buildwas; Secretary of the National Society for Wrockwardine Deanery.
Bott, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Curate of Morpeth; Curate-in-Charge of St. Aidan's, Elswick.
Carr, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of St. Sebastian's, Wokingham; Vicar of Addington, Surrey.
Cowley, Rev. Daniel Scurr, M.A., Vicar of German, Isle of Man; Rector of Bride, Isle of Man.
Crawford, Rev. C. H. P., M.A., Vicar of Milborne Port; Secretary of the National Society for Merston Deanery (Milborne Port District).
Croly, Rev. George H., A.M.; Canon of Ardagh in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Killala.
Davies, Rev. William, Curate of St. James's, Bristol; Vicar of St. Gabriel's, Bristol.
Donaldson, Rev. Frederic Lewis, M.A.; Rector of Nailstone, Leicestershire.
Ducat, Rev. W. M. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading; Honorary Canon of Christ Church.
Egerton, Rev. Prebendary G. H., M.A., Rector of Myddle; Rural Dean of Wem.
English, Rev. W. W., M.A., D.C.L.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of London.
Fearon, Rev. Arthur; Vicar of St. Sebastian's, Wokingham, Berks.
Finch, Rev. A. T., M.A.; Vicar of Kingsclere, Hampshire.
Fryer, Rev. Arthur Girdlestone, M.A.; Chaplain of the House of Rest, Shanklin, Isle of Wight.
Girling, Rev. F. J. W., M.A., Curate of Combs, Stowmarket; Vicar of Shernbourne and Fring, Norfolk.
Gray, Rev. R. D. H., M.A., Vicar of Chatburn, Lancashire; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Griffith, Rev. Charles Edward Osborne, M.A.; Vicar of Egglestone, Darlington.
Haslehurst, Rev. W. G., Rector of West Felton; Rural Dean of Ellesmere.
Howell, Rev. Arthur J., M.A., Curate of St. Gabriel's, Pimlico; Vicar of Capel, Dorking.
Hughes, Rev. J. E., M.A., Vicar of Cheswardine; Honorary R.D.S. for the Church Army in the Deanery of Hodnet, Lichfield.
Hutchings, Rev. W. H., M.A., Rector of Kirby Misperton and Rural Dean; Canon and Prebend of Husthwaite in York Cathedral.
Johnson, Rev. Theodore, Chief Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Rochester; Vicar of Bodiam, Sussex.
Jones, Rev. Richard, Curate of Dowlais; Rector of Henllys-w-Bettws, Monmouthshire.
Kent, Rev. G. W. R. C., M.A., lately Chaplain at Alderbury Union Workhouse; Chaplain to the Salisbury Hospital and General Infirmary.
Kingston, Rev. J., Chaplain R.N., late Rector of Cattistock; Permission to Officiate at Southwick, Brighton, in the Diocese of Chichester.
Lake, Rev. Henry Ashton, M.A., Vicar of Castle Hedingham; Rector of Chelmsford,
Leathley, Rev. James Forde; Incumbent of Augher, Diocese of Clogher.
Ludlow, Rev. Thomas Binfield, M.A.; Rector of Wolverton and Ewhurst, Hants.
Maber, Rev. J. Stroud, Curate of St. Mary's, Ross; Vicar of Clifton-on-Teme, Worcester.
Mills, Rev. W. H., Vicar of Kelstern; Vicar of Hackthorn, Lincoln.
Minton-Senhouse, Rev. Hugh McNeile, M.A.; Vicar of All Saints', Jersey.
Mitchell, Rev. A. P., M.A., Curate of Saltburn-by-the-Sea; Rector of Brotton-in-Cleveland, Yorkshire.
Mitchell, Rev. Robert James, A.M.; Incumbent of Drumsnatt, Diocese of Clogher.
Molyneux, Rev. Sir John C., Bart., LL.B., Vicar of Portisham; Secretary of the National Society for Bridport Deanery (Abbotsbury Portion).
Moore, Rev. Canon J. H., M.A.; Chaplain to the Bishop of Truro.
Moore, Rev. John H., A.K.C., Curate of Headington, Oxford; Rector of Upton-with-Aston Upthorpe, Berks.
Moull, Rev. C. A., M.A., Curate of Hove; Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Hove.
Obbard, Rev. A. N., M.A., Rector of Chilbolton; Secretary of the National Society for Stockbridge Deanery.
Owen, Rev. Loftus Meade, B.A.; Rector of Hordley, Salop.
Partridge, Rev. Francis, D.D., Rector of St. George's, Halifax, N.S., and Canon of the Cathedral; Dean of Fredericton, N.B.
Pater, Rev. Septimus, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Jarrow; Vicar of Pallion, Sunderland.
Paterson, Rev. L. R., M.A., Vicar of Langham; Secretary of the National Society for Holt Deanery.
Penny, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Rector-Designate of Wolverhampton; Rural Dean of Wolverhampton.
Phillips, Rev. Ernest Augustine, B.A.; Rector of Barwick, Somersetshire.
Pim, Rev. John, B.D., Rector of Inch; Incumbent of Ballywillan (Portrush).
Powning, Rev. James Furneaux, M.A., Curate of Uffculme; Senior Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Exeter.
Reed, Rev. W., M.A., the Hermitage, Southsea; Secretary of the National Society for Landport and Portsmouth Deaneries.
Robinson, Rev. Frederick, M.A.; Rector of Merton, Devonshire.
Robinson, Rev. F. A. C., Curate of Taplow; Curate of St. George's Cathedral, Perth, West Australia.
Seaton, Rev. George Flint, B.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Smith, Rev. Harold, M.A., Curate of St. Matthew's, Cambridge; Chaplain and Censor of King's College, London.
Spicer, Rev. J. M., Chaplain of Christ Church, Laxey; Vicar of Malew, Isle of Man.
Swabey, Rev. Henry Birchfield; Chaplain of Bath United Hospital.
Usher, Rev. Canon J. H., M.A., Vicar of Cambois and Rural Dean; Vicar of Bedlington, Northumberland.
Waters, Rev. Robert E.; Incumbent of Knock-Columbkille, Diocese of Down.
Weldon, Rev. Lewen Burton, D.D., Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Weymouth; Chaplain to the Weymouth Union Workhouse.
Weston, Rev. Walter Charles; Vicar of St. Andrew's, West Bromwich.
Williams, Rev. Frederick, M.A.; Rector of Chignall St. Mary's and St. James's-with-Mashbury, Chelmsford.
Woodall, Rev. Thomas John, Vicar of Britford; Chaplain to the Alderbury Union Workhouse.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Dudding, Rev. Horatio Nelson, for fifty-two years Vicar of the parish, at St. Peter's Vicarage, St. Albans, on the 1st inst., aged 86.
Hill, Rev. Edward, priest, for twenty-three years Rector of the parish, at Wishford Rectory, on the Feast of the Purification, aged 77.
King, Rev. Bryan, late Vicar of Avebury, Wilts, formerly Rector of St. George's, E.C., at Highwood, Weston-super-Mare, on the 30th ult.
Lempriere, Rev. William, M.A., Seigneur de Rosel, at Ventnor, on the 31st ult., aged 76.
Lovely, Rev. George, nineteen years Vicar of St. Mary Key, and formerly Chaplain in Bengal, at Ipswich, on the 1st inst., aged 69.
Maddison, Rev. George, late Archdeacon of Ludlow, at Tuckhill Vicarage, Bridgnorth, on the 30th ult., aged 85.
Norman, Rev. Robert M., Rector of Bottesford, at Bottesford Rectory, Nottingham, on the 1st inst., aged 40.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE OXFORD CALCUTTA MISSION.

BY THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. MARY MAGDALENE CHURCH, PADDINGTON, ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 17TH, 1895.

"This is my Commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you."—ST. JOHN xv. 12.

I GREATLY fear that my presence here to-day may be due to the over-persuasion of kind friends which it would have been better to have continued to resist.

Those who have been out in the foreign Mission-field have, of course, a right to speak to us. We look up to them morally and spiritually as the closest followers of the footsteps of the Apostles, as they followed the Divine Master, "Who for our sakes became poor."

But for the rest of us who have remained at home we must feel that all we can do is to pray and give, that others may go—we have little or no right to speak, and urge others to do what we have not done ourselves.

For these obvious reasons I have, as some of you know, again and again declined your kind invitation to preach or speak, not from want of interest or belief in the inestimable importance of the great work, but from obvious unfitness.

My only apology for taking any part in the work at all must be drawn from the fact that it comes to me inseparably with whatever conscious Church life I have been permitted to have during the last thirty years.

It is only as one who has been allowed to live near others who were working that I can venture to speak of the work.

I have seen others working, and, what is more, I have been near enough to feel something of the heat of the fire by which some of them were tested, and on account of which the brightness of their lives has been made manifest.

Missionary work, whether at home or abroad, always appears to me to be part of the fruit of the suffering of the Church during the last thirty years—I mean the revival of missionary work in Oxford.

About forty or forty-three years ago I remember the beginning of the chill which came over us from the new philosophy; at first it was used as little more than a new source of additional knowledge, from which we might illustrate the old, and then the newer views of moral philosophy began gradually to take the place of the old. New schools were opened for the study of the natural or physical sciences, with all their fascinating, absorbing, remunerative interests. New opportunities seemed to open continually of placing the studies of the University in touch with the living world outside. The fields of history were thrown open, and men were led to explore them with philosophic insight and patience, with the practical desire to take part in and guide the rising forces of national life. In all this opening up of real truth it was not to be wondered at that some of the younger members of the University were bewildered and perplexed. Much that was new was undoubtedly true and of incalculable value, but all did not see at once that the habit of discovering and determining truth by one method might incapacitate a student from discovering and determining it in another. Physical facts seemed so much more sure than moral ones that it appeared wiser and safer to some to equip themselves for the struggle of life by a knowledge of the former rather than of the latter.

Materialism settled down upon us. A purely intellectual method of criticism was applied to Holy Scripture. The comparison of different systems of religion, among which Christianity was included, was thought by some to be the way which would lead to a scientific knowledge of religious truth.

No doubt this search for elements of truth in the religious systems of the world was a great advance upon some older methods, which regarded all non-Christian religions as almost equally and entirely false. The modern method was, in a large degree, far more in accordance with the spirit of Him Who said, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," and "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil."

But the method was often used imperfectly; portions of heathen religious books were assumed to be fair samples of the whole. The precepts of one religion were contrasted with the practices of another, and Christianity was looked upon by some only as an alternative choice, offering, perhaps, not many advantages. This method, however, required work and learning, and it revealed the vastness and antiquity, if not the strength, by which some of the non-Christian systems of religion would be defended.

After a while there seemed to be a turn. We had recovered a little from the novelty, and quickly seen value, of the facts of physical science. We began to see better its true value—as dear Charles Marriott said forty-three years ago, in speaking of the study of physical science:—"I think I saw about how far it could lead me." We felt the reproof of Beatrice; we had been, in a way, deceived by the present things:—

> Piangendo dissi: le presenti cose
> Col falso lor piacer volser miei passi.
>
> *Purg.* xxxi. 34-35.

We came back to the older position that the facts of which we were most sure were not such as we could see, and touch, and weigh. They were not physical. We knew we were. We felt the difference between saying this is white and that is black, and this is right or that is wrong. We saw in all the great religious systems marks of duty and a desire of something higher. As we looked around at the poor in the crowded cities and country villages, we saw in them lives and characters which necessitated our admiration and our love; and we began to see more clearly the reality and the strength of the moral and religious forces; we saw that without love the individual never could be perfect; we saw that love is the true bond of States; we saw the ladder set up on earth again, and the top reaching to heaven; we saw it more clearly than before; sorrow and suffering had purged our sight; we saw it set up at every cottage door and home; we saw it ready to be set up in any land, for that all nations of men were made of one blood that they should seek the Lord if haply they might feel after Him and find Him.

We saw the ladder more clearly than before, we could see the steps—Duty, Conscience, God, Bible, Christ, Church.

We had come to this in the midst of intellectual trouble; we had learnt something of the intellectual systems of India and China, and so some determined to do their utmost to prepare themselves intellectually, and go amongst the disciples of the great religions of the East, and show them their appreciation of what was true in those defective systems, and yet the supreme excellence of Christianity. Here I feel that I must restrain myself with a strong hand, and omit the mention of names of many, who prepared themselves, and then gave themselves to this work in different parts of the Mission-field. They gave up Oxford and England, after they had fitted themselves to enjoy its highest pleasures, and their lives have been ever since our guiding-star here at home. They need not the praise of man, for verily they shall have their reward.

In 1874 was founded, in a very unpretending manner, the Oxford Graduates' Missionary Association, by means of which many of the more intellectual amongst us were enabled to test and increase their knowledge by listening to addresses given by the more thoughtful missionaries who came to us from the Mission-field.

In 1876 an effort was made to found a small society called St. Stephen's House, in which Oxford graduates might reside, and continue their study of the more philosophical religious systems under the guidance of resident professors, and with the advantage of the libraries of the University, together with some simple opportunities for living a religious life. In 1880 the Oxford Mission to Calcutta was begun. The idea was that we should send men intellectually qualified to discuss the philosophical systems of the Oriental religions with their own representatives in their own land, and in their own language, which required a knowledge both of the vernacular and Sanscrit. Besides this, it was intended that we should send out men who were well acquainted with the current literature of Europe, and so able to save the intelligent young men in Calcutta from losing their way in the "dark wood" of modern sceptical writings.

Here I must pause for a moment to pay an unworthy tribute to my dear friend, the first leader of our Oxford Mission to Calcutta, Edward Willis. He gave himself without any reserve to the double training of heart and head, of life and learning. His saintly life he strove to make more effective for others by constant, unwearied study. To the usual knowledge of Latin and Greek he added Hebrew, Rabbinic, Sanscrit; and to these he soon added the vernacular necessary for intercourse with the native people in Calcutta. Besides the ancient and Oriental languages, he could read easily the current literature in French, German, and Italian. Never was a life more freely and fully given. The mysterious illness by which he was taken from his work, and under which he still exhibits to us the silent, uncomplaining witness of his utter resignation to the Divine Will, ought at least to keep the memory of his example living before us. Often as I have pondered and prayed over this mysterious visitation, of one thing I am increasingly sure—that if only it should be the means of stimulating others to give themselves to the work with the same singleness of purpose, then he would willingly and gladly live on to witness to the thoroughness of the sacrifice required, by a life which, to the world, is a living death.

The Oxford Mission to Calcutta was commenced in 1880. The following year, 1881, was made an epoch in the intellectual troubles of the last forty years by the Bampton Lectures of the present learned Bishop of Salisbury. The book is called, as most of you know, the "One Religion": it is a summary of what we had been learning in the previous thirty years. It maintained the supremacy of the Bible over all other religious books:—

> Infidels (the Bishop says) may scoff at portions of the Bible; they may attack detached pieces of its morality, or laugh at details of its history, or bring out with triumph the supposed incongruity of some of its doctrines. All this and more they have done, and will continue to do; but if they have any remains of fairness, they will at the same time admit the marvellous literary supremacy of the Bible, even in translations, its unique power to soothe and to alarm the conscience, its extraordinary unity of tone from Genesis to Revelation, its adaptation to the genius of every nation into whose language it has been rendered, its authority at every stage of civilisation (pp. 149-150).

In a word, after a review of the hopes and fears and consolations offered to us by other known

systems of religion, the Bishop concludes: It is in the Christian religion alone that we find an answer to the three great needs of man—truth, holiness, and peace.

By this time many were feeling reassured as to the reality of moral and religious forces, and a new desire was enkindled amongst us to prove their reality by testing them upon the lives of the people.

Missions from colleges and public schools were formed in London and in other large towns. Men were eager to go; others gave themselves to work in Africa or the colonies; and a quiet, determined band of self-denying men have continued for fourteen years to carry on the work of our Mission at Calcutta. It would be invidious to mention any, when it is impossible to speak of all—though to all our deepest thanks are due—one, perhaps, from his position as head of the Mission, the Rev. Henry Whitehead, late Scholar and now Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, with his strong intelligence and saintly simplicity and purity of life, may be mentioned as the very embodiment of the original idea under which the Mission was founded. As head of the Bishop's College he is specially engaged in preparing native candidates for the ministry, while in immediate connection with him, and under his superintendence is a large school for native boys, under the teaching of members of the Mission, with others, who are well qualified to prepare them to enter and pass through the Calcutta University: thus providing the most important assistance that could be given for the spreading of Christianity in India, a native graduate ministry.

It is impossible to do justice to the work which is being done by the self-devoted lives of the members of this Mission. There is the daily instruction given in the schools and in the college, the addresses and lectures to larger audiences in the city; the constant vindication of the truth in their own newspapers and other periodicals and publications; the more direct offer of head and heart in their unwavering determination to be accessible to all, too often at times when other work has left them exhausted, regardless not only of their comfort but of their health; striving to keep before themselves the example of Him Who gave His time to talk with one, and that by night—such lives coupled with such high intelligence, and so obviously capable of the innocent enjoyment of the highest pleasures which the world has to give, could not be without their strong effect on all who have the happiness to come near them. Only last Sunday I received the following unintentional testimony from a young man working in Rangoon, who was paying a short visit to the Mission in Calcutta:—

> It is most delightful being with such men as these of the Oxford Mission. Yesterday I went with Mr. Whitehead to a village in the Sunderbund, where we had most interesting services. We had about a hundred and fifty native Christians in church, and seventy-one communicants.

This is but one of many who have found refreshment and encouragement from the work and lives of the Mission.

For one special object, in conclusion, I ask your aid this morning. The special object of the Oxford Mission is, as I have said, to offer Christianity to the intelligent people in India in such a way that it may reach both the head and the heart. They are especially anxious to provide a body of intelligent and highly educated native Christians, who may then become the teachers and guides of their own countrymen. With this object they are now engaged in a new venture of faith, in providing a hostel, in which young native students may reside when they come to Calcutta with the view of graduating in the University. There are some thousands of such men every year in Calcutta, but there is little or no provision made for lodging, and little or no supervision exercised over their lives. It is only too obvious into what life-long miseries many of such youths must fall. To obtain a suitable house and premises for the purpose the Mission will require some £4,000. A part of this they have already raised. It is especially to aid them in this new venture of their faith that I ask your aid this morning. I have spoken of missionary work as coming to me as one of the first fruits of trouble. The Psalmist tells us what, in such cases, the result should be. "We went through fire and water, and Thou broughtest us out into a wealthy place. I will go into Thine house with burnt-offering, and will pay Thee my vows, which I promised with my lips and spake with my mouth when I was in trouble." The burnt-offering, you will remember, was an offering which was wholly given to God; it was the symbol of perfect self-surrender and self-sacrifice. Now it is precisely to this point that God has led us.

I have spoken to you of the rehabilitation of moral philosophy amongst us in Oxford. Last year a climax seemed to be reached by the subject chosen for the well-known Bampton Lectures; it was "Personality," "the name of the unity in which all a man's attributes and functions meet." The preacher told us what the constituent elements of personality are—viz., reason, will, and love. You will see at once what our burnt-offering should be; you will see what is our reasonable service, and you will, I think, recognise that it falls in very exactly with the idea of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta. It is made still more plain by considering the two conceptions of Personality, which are in an especial manner due to Christianity—its unity and universality.

Its unity implies that no department of our being should be withheld, our reason, our will, our love should each of them be disciplined, purified, perfected, and made one; its universality implies that we should make no limit of race, or rank, or sex,

but honour all men everywhere, and with reverence, patience, faith, and love seek for these hidden treasures of Personality, which lie hid in every man and woman scattered over the face of the earth. That is, we should seek to restore in them the image of God. So we come back to our text, as the children of Israel came back again after forty years of wandering to the borders of the Promised Land: "Love one another as I have loved you." Love is the outcome of an entire personality. It is our very self, and not a department of ourselves that loves. This is what the members of the Calcutta Mission set before themselves to do, by a life of self-discipline and study to perfect their whole personality, that they might give it to God, and in God to their fellow-men—that is, that they might love them. Brethren, there must be some in this congregation to-day who feel with me that here at least in this parish and in this church such language is no mere empty use of words—here both you and I have often seen and heard one who loved without keeping back a part, and who was ever striving to love us more and more. May the memory of his love be with us in our separated spheres of life, and may it move us to-day to do what we can for those whom not having seen yet we can love in Him and for Him Who loved us and gave Himself for us, and Who bids us love one another even as He loved us.

It was officially announced on the 7th inst. that the Queen had approved of the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Percival, head master of Rugby, to the bishopric of Hereford, in succession to the late Dr. Atlay. Dr. Percival was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, of which society he was successively Scholar and Fellow. After gaining the Junior Mathematical Scholarship in 1855, he took a double First in Moderations in the following year, and a double First in the Final Schools in 1858. He was ordained in 1860, and from 1860 to 1862 he was an assistant-master at Rugby under the present Bishop of London, when he resigned to become the first head master of Clifton College. He remained at Clifton till 1878, in which year he succeeded the Rev. Samuel Wayte as President of Trinity College, Oxford, and, after nine years' residence at Oxford, he was appointed Head Master of Rugby, on the retirement of Dr. Jex-Blake to the Rectory of Alvechurch in 1887. Dr. Percival, who became an Hon. LL.D. of the University of St. Andrews in 1870, was Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Temple) from 1869 to 1882, and a Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral from 1871 to 1882. On the translation of Dr. Temple to London, he acted for a short time as one of his Examining Chaplains, and in 1882 Dr. Percival was appointed by Lord Selborne to a canonry of Bristol, which he resigned in 1887. Dr. Percival, who had twice been Select Preacher at Oxford, was one of the founders of University College, Bristol, and has (says the *Times*) taken a conspicuous part in the work of University Extension. It will be remembered that last year the Bishop-Designate wrote to the *Times* in defence of Welsh Disestablishment.

IMMANUEL.

By the Rev. ALFRED AINGER, M.A., Master of the Temple, and Canon of Bristol.

Sermon Preached in the Temple Church on Christmas Morning, 1894.

"Therefore the Lord Himself shall give you a sign. Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call His name Immanuel."—Isa. vii. 14.

In no case, it has been truly said, is it so difficult to disengage the mind from the association of its fulfilment, and to endeavour to ascertain its original meaning, as in the case of the prophecy of Immanuel; and of course the chief reason for this is that nine readers of the Bible out of ten probably recall this passage from Isaiah almost wholly through its citation by St. Matthew in the first chapter of his Gospel, in announcing the circumstances attending the birth of Jesus Christ. "All this was done," he writes, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet." Yet our appointed lessons for Christmas Day bring the original narrative from Isaiah before us. Let us then briefly recall the circumstances which first called it forth. Isaiah, the greatest and most typical of the prophets, the essential champion of God's righteousness to a disobedient and gainsaying people, was living in the reign of Ahaz, the corrupt king of Judah. Judah being threatened by the allied kings, Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah king of Israel, Ahaz had received a definite warning how and in what spirit to resist this attack, and later Isaiah was instructed to add yet another warning and to implore Ahaz, if he were still unbelieving, to ask of God a sign proving that the Divine words should not be in vain; and in his hypocrisy or in mock humility will not accept the offer. "I will not ask," he said, "neither will I tempt the Lord." And then Isaiah was commissioned to reply, "The Lord Himself shall give you a sign," and that sign was to be that a virgin should give birth to a Son who should grow up with nobler, higher, purer ideas than those of the corrupt generation in which He should be called; that even before this child, who was to bear the name of Immanuel, should arrive at years of discretion, the allied powers of Syria and Ephraim should be crushed and abandoned by both their kings.

It is, therefore, as obvious as any possible inference could be that Isaiah was in the first instance predicting an event that was to happen in the lifetime of King Ahaz, and was to be a sign to him and to his people. An event that was to happen seven centuries later could not possibly be a sign and token to persons who would then have been seven centuries in their grave; and, moreover, the promise is distinct that before the child called

Immanuel should have grown up the national deliverance from the threatened invasion of Syria and Israel should have occurred. "Before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good" —before, that is to say, he shall have attained to full discretion and responsibility—"the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." If the words have any meaning, it is absolutely certain that Isaiah was talking of an immediate intervention in human shape of some one who would bring overmastering power to bear on the side of the nation over which Ahaz ruled. Of course it seems strange to us; and it is disappointing that we learn no more of who the mysterious figure was who was promised to the people as a sign, and who was to appear in the time of persons still living. But the lessons we learn from the prediction lose nothing of their profound meaning from these circumstances.

It is the name, and all that that implies, which concerns us. Isaiah, writing for the Hebrew race, does not lay stress upon the significance of that name. St. Matthew, we all know, adds the translation, so to speak, of it—"God with us." There was to arise as God's representative and champion, as God's witness and the reflection of His character, even in the lifetime of King Ahaz, one not unworthy to bear this name. That is to say—and we must not shrink from admitting it—there lived one, at least, seven hundred years before the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom it was no sacrilege to apply the title afterwards to be given to the Redeemer of the world, "God with us"—that is to say, of God among men and fighting for men—an example and also a power. I have said one at least; but if there was ever one deserving to bear the name there must have been more, for wherever there appears among men one among their number teaching them about God, reflecting God's nature, leading them on to higher things in God's name, there is God with men. But never do we find a man perfectly doing this, because the mere man, however earnest for God and inspired by Him, is always limited by his humanity. He must needs share the weaknesses, the failings, the sins of his brethren. Never but once in the world's history has there appeared in human shape a saint who was all-saintly, a wise man who was all-wise, a power for good who was all-powerful. The birth of that one Saint, of that one Power for good, that one Deliverer of mankind from the evils to which they are subjected, we commemorate to-day. But just because of this great fact we are not to neglect or to disparage all the partial and limited saintliness that had been sent to the world's deliverance before this final and perfect fulfilment came to pass; and there is one remarkable instance in our Lord's life recorded by St. John, the lesson of which is closely parallel to that of the prophecy in our text. When Jesus claimed to be the Son of God, the Jews saw quite clearly that this was indeed nothing less than the claim to be Divine, and they cried out that this was blasphemy. And what was His reply? Jesus reminded His hearers that the earliest judges and leaders of the people of Israel, as testified by the language of their Scriptures, had been called God. "Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If He called them gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of Him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

The judges and rulers of the early days of Israel had been called gods because their office and function was just this—to represent God on earth to men, to reflect His character, and do His will, and lead His people. They often failed to do this because they were merely human. In some cases they were false to their trust, and then God's vengeance overtook them. Yet they pointed to that one far-off Divine event when One who should perfectly fulfil that name was to interpose for the world's deliverance. And thus, my brethren, just as the implied prophecy in calling men gods was to be one day fulfilled, so the prophecy of Isaiah to-day before us was also a prophecy of that same later far-off event, when one who was in every sense "God with us" should come to satisfy the needs and the longings of the human heart. And this should be our comfort in pondering over the difficulties, and they must needs be many, of those prophetic utterances which were read every year at this season.

To some of us, I am sure, there is a sense of pain in admitting that the predictions which the Church has for so long called Messianic, and rightly so-called, had beforehand a more literal and less important fulfilment. To some of us even to-day it may sound as if we were derogating from the honour and reverence due to Jesus Christ exclusively in admitting that the prediction which unquestionably applies to Him may have applied also to others. But I believe a very little reflection will show us that we are wrong, and that we shall even better understand the great gift which this day brought us that the mighty principle, so to speak, carried out in the Incarnation was no new principle; but the education of the world had thus far been worked out by the Creator of the world through partial fulfilment and gradual progress before, for every step in the world's education and the gradual revelation of God in the advance from lower to higher levels of wisdom and power had been achieved through the witness formed by God's representatives on earth. Every patriarch, lawgiver, priest, judge, king, so far as he had been faithful to God's words, had been God with us. What are those words still in our ears from the Epistle for to-day: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days

spoken unto us by His Son." Yes, every prophet who spoke God's Word in God's name was Himself in His degree and in His kind—for every prophet had his own individuality and his own proper and distinct function—God with men. Does it derogate from the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ that those who saw Him from afar looked forward to His coming, were themselves, however fettered by their human limitations of character and wisdom, helping the blessed work that He was to accomplish in its fulness, and how, by the same means and the same path, they may tread this earth together, and help the world to better things?

The prophets were then, one and all, pointing to and predicting the event of this day, although in God's all-wise but hidden purpose that event was to happen many centuries later. It is therefore wasted labour, surely, to argue, as men are apt to do, whether a particular prophecy had an immediate as well as an ultimate fulfilment; whether it applied to Jesus Christ alone, or to some other helper of men first; for the true reply to all arguings is that if it referred to one it must also refer to all; that every promise of a Divine helper in the near distance was a promise of one in the far. We are not diminishing, not detracting from the supreme gift of Christmas, by recognising this blessed fact that through man the world is helped, but only perfectly helped, only entirely delivered from evil, from sin, and the death that came by sin, when One walked this earth in human shape, but who was Himself one with the Father—God with us: not one afar off and imaged by imperfect and feeble representatives on earth, still less a God evolved out of our moral, or too often our immoral, consciences, the creation of selfish hopes or selfish fears, of dark suggestions and crude imaginings; but God so near to us that we see Him as He is, and enjoy His perpetual presence and benediction. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father"; for my brethren there is this individual, personal application and the name of Immanuel, which, I think, has been too much overlooked. God with us has been too exclusively interpreted as God with the nation, or God with a church; and when we hear only that in the words the great truth may lapse into one of those generalities which it is so easy to acquiesce in, or, yet more fatal result, so easy to escape from. For how much we lose if we neglect the dear and familiar sense of companionship with us individually, and everyone who accepts Immanuel has the promise of a companion ever with Him, ever at His side, exhibiting the nature of God and therefore His will in human shape, and never-failing Monitor and Encourager on life's journey. "God with us!" There is no other religion known to men that has ever made them this offer and this promise, the highest of all, the Father of mankind walking by our side in human shape so that we might test every act, thought and word by the knowledge how a fellow-man, if only we were altogether God-like, would act and think and speak. How can we wonder that such a doctrine should be to a human soul either the greatest and most cherished of blessings or the most awful and most repellent of spectres? for to accept the event of Christmas is to accept as its inevitable consequence the perpetual companionship of Jesus Christ, for, lo, He is with us alway, even unto the end of the world. And He is thus with us because we cannot outgrow Him, or supersede Him. He is with us. Yet for all our boasted growth of knowledge and all the accumulated lessons, as we call them, of experience, we still lag behind and forget Him and are unworthy of Him and crucify Him afresh. Progress, forsooth! We talk glibly of the progress of civilisation as if it were something in itself to be proud of as pointing to the inevitable triumph of good. But there surely can be no virtue in progress, in the thought of it, until we have ascertained what our progress is towards. That we are ever moving may be true and certain; but moving towards what? In the material and æsthetic arts, in culture, in scientific discovery, in victory over the earth's problems and difficulties, over time and space, we may speak with some rational meaning of progress. But with every new, every individual soul born among us, what does it gain of personal good from the world's moral experience and research? Is it found easier as the world goes on for that individual soul to be true to its divine origin and destiny because of the inheritance of moral wisdom to which it succeeds. We are all the richer as regards the conveniences of bodily life from the progress of science and art. Yet of two natures born into the world still to this day one is found taking the law of the Lord for its guide, and is happy and strong, even though poor and sick and the reverse of prosperous; and another rejects that law and follows its own will and lusts, and though outwardly prosperous and content is dead while it lives. Alas! to talk of progress, to look to it for the bettering of the world, for the purifying of the individual, what is it but to throw dust in the eyes of others and ourselves, and to forget to our infinite loss that there is no progress for ourselves but into the fellowship and inspiration of the Son of Man, God with us.

"God with us." Yes; and this means omnipotence with us, omniscience with us, perfection with us, and the love that never fails. Some of us, perhaps, have tried, in conformity with the passion for getting rid of the supernatural that marks the latest struggle of the scientific world, have tried to construct a new religion out of the old, in which the same pathetic and lovely figure as before shall be placed beside us for our example; but from whom the aureole of deity has been taken away; they have been trying to find all that

life needs in the presence only of a fellow-man, however superior to ourselves in holiness and purity. There are moments in our lives when we feel ourselves face to face with sin, in the presence of sorrow or of death from which no man can deliver us. In the sad hours of your life, it has been said, the recollection of that Man you read of in your childhood, the Man of sorrows, the great Sympathiser with human woes and sufferings, rises up before you. I know it is a reality for you then, for you feel it to be not only beautiful, but true. In such moments does it seem to you as if Christ were merely a person who eighteen hundred years ago made certain journeyings between Judea and Galilee? Can such a recollection fill up the blank which some present grief, the loss of some friend, has made in your heart? It does not. It never did this for you or for anyone. But the comfort that came to you from the thought of Him may be safely trusted not to betray you, for that voice that came to you in your anguish says, "You may trust Me, you may lean upon Me, for I know all things in heaven and earth. I and My Father are one." Is the whisper too good to be true? Is it too much in accordance with the timid anticipations and longings of your spirit not to be rejected?

My brethren, are these thoughts not jubilant enough for Christmas Day? Joy cannot always be jubilant. The events of the last week, as of how many other Christmas seasons in years gone by, have come to remind us that Christmas may be saddened by tidings all round of death and disease, and may still, and not the less, be a time of profoundest joy, for even calamity takes another colouring from the event of Christmas, for though creation still groans and travails for deliverance, the hope and assurance of that deliverance is ever present—Immanuel, God with us. And meantime, out of sorrow, pain, death, spring new virtues, new graces, to deck the sombre earth with flowers, help, sympathy, heroism, self-sacrifice. To meet human needs human pity springs, showing that the Spirit of Christ still lives; even sorrow is transfigured into joy, sorrow that is not sorrow, but delight because of the glory that redounds to human kind and what we are.

WE regret to learn that the Bishop of Rochester has had a return of his former illness and is confined to bed. All his engagements must for the present be cancelled.

THE Bishop of Peterborough left London on Saturday for Rome, where he will lecture on "The Rome of the Renaissance and the Influence of the Popes on Roman Architecture."

THE Merchant Taylors' Company have voted £21 in aid of the work of the Church Army amongst the despairing and destitute. The Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (Lord Houghton) has also sent a donation to the Church Army for the same object.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1895.

CLEVER HEATHENS.

UNDOUBTEDLY we are confronted, at the end of the nineteenth century, with significant criminal phenomena all over the civilised world. In our own country criminal statistics are involved and misleading, and our system of justice suffers large numbers of criminals to go undetected, or at least unexposed and unpunished by law. This is chiefly so in the very class of crimes which is on the increase—commercial frauds and breaches of trust. Our laws hardly touch the guilty parties. And even when they might they do not always get the chance. The many serious scandals and frauds which have taken place during the last few years have resembled one another in this, that the guilty parties have got off scot free, or nearly so. And it has just been openly suggested, with more than a show of foundation, that a famous judge has been "translated" because he seemed inclined to administer justice on principles more severe and rigid than those in vogue. There is a very general feeling in England that what may be called the more artistic and complicated kinds of crime are dangerously on the increase, and that the public is inadequately protected. If this is so, it does not make much difference whether the figures of the commoner kinds of crime, connected with drink and brutality, show an increase or not. If they did not it might imply that our criminal classes were perhaps less brutal, and more clever, but not a whit less criminal. But, as a matter of fact, we do not get much comfort from our pauper and prison statistics.

Facts are clearer on the Continent. The Swiss cantons have, almost without exception, gone back to capital punishment, which speaks volumes.

Italy has been struggling with a marked increase of crime for years. France has had the same experience, with the added lesson that the increase of crime has gone hand in hand with the spread of secularism in the schools and elsewhere. Lately the correspondent of the *Standard* in Paris has been drawing Tacitean pictures of the corruption and depravity of Parisian life. Perhaps the grimmest touch is that upon the administration of poor-relief. The sums spent in this way would stagger an Englishman; three-quarters of the money is spent corruptly, and in many cases relief is denied to poor people for the crime of having had their children baptized. It must be added that the wearisome iteration of "chantage" scandals and the like, shows something very rotten in the Parisian conscience. Whole herds of rascals have fed fat for years upon the fear of exposure felt by prominent individuals in all classes of life, who ought to have had nothing to be ashamed of. Our own colonies have not been free from the same phenomena, either in Canada, Newfoundland, or Australia, neither are they better off in the United States. Probably at no period in modern European history have fraud, corruption, dishonour, and dishonesty in large affairs been so rife as they are now.

No doubt much of this is due to the wrongs done in the name of liberty. Without making the old play upon liberty and licence, it is clear that many persons resent any kind of restraint as incompatible with freedom. The sternness of the old "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not," finds many qualifications. In the cant of the day the individual claims to "live out himself"—*i.e.*, to be a law unto himself without any uncomfortable restrictions. The disciplinary value of going without what you might be able to get without much, or any, sacrifice of principle, has been quite lost sight of. And this is bound to end, sooner or later, in trying to get what you want without any regard to principles at all. Which is precisely what we see going on around us.

The figures which come to hand from Victoria seem to narrow down the issue. In that colony, during the decade 1881-91, the native-born population has increased 42·9 per cent. Crime has increased in the same period 88 per cent. We are not told the original proportion of crime to population, but it was certainly not low. And during the last ten years criminals have increased more than twice as fast as the rest of the population. A still more significant fact is that this increase has occurred chiefly among the population under 21 years old. The new recruits to the criminal army are not those who have sunk through drink, or disease, or loss of wage-earning power, but young men and women at the beginning of adult life, just at the best moment for aiming at an honest living. In their case it must be the education which is to blame.

In Victoria education is wholly secular. Religious ministers may attend and give voluntary religious instruction at the close of the regular school hours, but any suggestion of religion is carefully excluded from the curriculum. From one of the readers, which are the same as those used in England, a description of Jerusalem has been expunged; from another, which contains Burns' "Cottar's Saturday Night," the verses which describe the Bible reading have been cut out in the same way. And the result is, not only a vast accession to the criminal population, but the "larry" and "larrikin," whose brutal antics form such a conspicuous blot upon life in the townships, and whose condemnation has been proclaimed in all literature dealing with our Australian Colonies since 1880. We are not surprised to hear that a radical change is contemplated, and that the restoration of religion to the schools will probably form the subject of a referendum in the near future. In fact, both at home and at the Antipodes, we are realising the truth of the Iron Duke's warning, uttered some fifty years ago, that "children educated without religion and the restraints of the moral law, would simply be clever heathens." The Duke was no theorist, like the men who devised the Educational Systems from which we are now everywhere suffering, but he had picked up his philosophy during a life of action. During his campaigns he had had to do with all sorts and conditions of men, chiefly scum, as he himself called them, and he had to depend upon his own judgment to make the best of them. The net result of his experience was that the man without any religion was no sort of use. Not that his standard of religion was a high one. He would not have expected much spirituality, and many popular manifestations of the religious spirit he would have summed up in language more expressive than devout. The Duke did not want saints in his armies, they might have embarrassed him, and given his enemies, and possibly himself, occasion to blaspheme. But what he believed in was the straightforward, honest teaching of the Catechism, which drove into a man's head the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and gave him at least a glimmering of his duty towards God and his neighbour, and of what he might expect if he did not do it. The man who had got that might or might not be clever, but he could not be a heathen.

With these facts before us, it is hard to believe that the penalising of religion in primary schools can continue to gain favour. What is more likely is that, at the end of the nineteenth century, we shall come back to the old Duke's point of view. Education, more or less secularised, has now been tried for upwards of a quarter of a century, and has been found wanting. It is valueless as a moral force, while, by bringing religion into disrepute, it

has most effectually cleared the field for the clever heathens, whom it equips in constantly-increasing numbers.

CHURCH NOTES.

CANON KNOX LITTLE, having been advised to rest for a few weeks, is going abroad. He hopes to return before Easter.

On Sunday morning Canon Garratt, Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ipswich, announced that he purposed asking the Bishop's permission to resign sometime in May. After remarking that for nearly twenty-eight years it had been his joy to be their pastor, he continued :—"I do not now feel so fit as I was for some of the details of parochial ministry, but am conscious of no failure of strength in other ways ; and while God seems to me closing by my age the door of parish work, I think He is opening before me doors of work of a different and Evangelistic kind. I earnestly desire to be permitted especially to preach and teach the much-forgotten truth of the Second Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in various places, wherever opportunities present themselves, and I shall, I doubt not, find my way made plain."

The fortnightly meeting of the executive committee of the Waifs and Strays Society was held on Monday, the 11th inst., at the Church House, the Rev. C. Pickering Clarke in the chair. It was reported that the receipts during the last fortnight were £1,802. Payments were voted amounting to £2,021. Reports were received from the clerical deputation secretaries and from the inspectress of boarded-out children. The certificate of the Local Government has been received in respect of the St. Oswald's Home, Cullercoats. The rules under which children are boarded out by the society were considered. A special report was submitted respecting the St. Hilda's Orphanage, Marylebone. It was decided, as in previous years, to issue an appeal for Lenten savings.

The Rev. H. Granville Dickson, secretary of the Church Defence Institution, 9, Bridge-street, Westminster, writes that henceforward, in accordance with resolutions adopted by the Central Church Committee, and the committee of the Church Defence Institution, the publications of the former will be issued from the office of the institution.

The Bishop of Lichfield and Archdeacon Scott being in accordance with the provisions of the Order in Council of March 1st, 1849, constituting the vicarage of St. James's, Wolverhampton, *ex officio* trustees of the patronage of the benefice, have nominated the Rev. George Everard, the Rev. John Richardson, and the Rev. Henry Bolland, to complete the number of five trustees in the said order mentioned.

Mr. Arthur Blomfield Jackson has been appointed a surveyor under the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act to the diocese of St. Albans.

The Dean of York, acting as commissary for the Archbishop of York, on Wednesday formally prorogued Convocation of the Northern Province to Wednesday next, when both Houses will sit for the transaction of business. The House of Laymen will, as already announced, meet on the 21st inst.

Resolutions have been proposed at the annual general meeting of the S.P.G., which took place at the National Society's House on the 8th inst., the purport of which were :—"That newspaper reporters and subscribers of not less than ten shillings shall be admitted to the annual meetings ; that special means be adopted (being a matter of the first importance to the spiritual interests of the Church at home) to urge publicly the duty of making greater efforts on behalf of foreign Missions ; that a special effort be made to encourage the local and diocesan formation of ladies' associations in connection with the society ; and that a special editor of the publications of the society be appointed."

In spite of the bitterly cold weather—there were more than 20 deg. of frost at 8.15—a very large number of members of the University of Oxford, from the Vice-Chancellor downwards, assembled on Friday at Canon Christopher's annual C.M.S. breakfast to hear the Bishop of Caledonia. Canon Christopher himself was received with the cordiality which his self-sacrificing earnestness must always demand from all members of the Church, to whatever party they may belong. The speech of the Bishop was one of the very best that the present writer has ever heard from any missionary—manly, straightforward, and earnest. The fact which he stated, that the native Indian population no longer decreases in numbers in the case of tribes which have become Christian, is one full of significance. He touched also on the difficult problem that is suggested by the acquisition of the hunting grounds of native tribes. Great consideration and care for the dispossessed native population should be, but apparently is not always, exhibited. The Bishop made his audience feel that Christianity was influencing the Indian tribes, and with genuine and beneficial consequences.

Mr. Gore preached the second of the three Sunday evening sermons at Oxford that he has promised to a very large congregation. His subject was prayer. Prayer must be always in conformity with what we know of the Divine will. Its model must be the Lord's Prayer—"Thy will be done." It must never be lawless. If once that is realised the difficulties of the relation of prayer to the Divine will or the course of nature are no greater than that of all human action. Prayer is one of the most potent facts in human history ; and the increase of knowledge does not do away with the necessity of it, but teaches us the truer way. Prayer is made necessary for us that we may learn in that and in our whole life to conform ourselves to God's will. That which we know is God's will we must certainly pray for ; that which we know is not God's will—the physically or morally impossible—that we must never pray for. All that is uncertain, in that we must pray as Christ did—"if it be possible." A very striking sermon was concluded by general rules as to prayer, and a touching allusion to an experience of the preacher's in the village of Radley of the power of constant prayer in ennobling the life of the simplest of men.

It is announced that the Archbishop of York will preach the Church Congress sermon this year at Norwich. A hope is entertained that the Duke of York may attend the Congress on the first day, and that a garden party at Sandringham may be one of the attractions of the week. The guarantee fund already amounts to nearly £1,600.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." February, 1895. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

THIS is not a particularly good number of the *Expositor*, but it has in it one really great paper by Principal Fairbairn, on "The Person of Christ: A Problem in the Philosophy of Religion."

Principal Fairbairn puts the dilemma decisively. Either Caiaphas and Pilate were right, or the "supernatural" view of the person of Jesus is right. The words of Caiaphas (in St. John xi.) are really (as he puts it) "those of gifted sagacity; Jesus was nothing, the mere creation of a fanaticism blinded by many disappointments, and though He was guiltless of crime, yet it was the high expedient of statesmanship to save the people by making an end of Him; and if He were only the common man the priest and the council conceived Him to be, who shall say that the priest was unwise.?" It is a dilemma; either agree with Caiaphas and Pilate, which most will shrink from doing, or the theory embodied in the Gospels is right.

And then the writer goes on to notice the extraordinary way in which men of science have shirked the religious element in man. Science has discussed nearly everything except, How is it, wherever you find man, you find him entirely governed by religious ideas? And you not merely find that he *was* so governed, but that he *still is*; religion is still so essential to man that he cannot escape from it, it still dominates him. And hence it follows that the greatest religious personage will be the most important person in history. And since, undoubtedly, this person is Jesus of Nazareth, what inference must we draw as to the nature of Him who occupies this foremost place?

Professor Ramsay writes on Professor Blass's theory of "Two Editions of the Acts," but, as the paper will be concluded next month, we have reserved it till then.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." February, 1895. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

THE "Notes on Recent Exposition" are chiefly occupied with Dr. Latham's book, "A Service of Angels," and they show that the hand which gave us "Pastor Pastorum," one of the most thoughtful and inspiring essays we have ever read, has by no means lost its cunning.

Mr. Headlam continues his papers on "The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans," and Dr. Stalker his on "The Parables of Zechariah." Both are very good.

"THE THINKER." February, 1895. London: James Nisbet & Co.

THE Rev. A. Wright, writing on the Synoptic Problem, gives some very striking evidence, from both India and China, as to the immense power of the human memory when it is specially trained and developed in the absence of books. In China children of welve years old knew the four Gospels by heart intelligently. Therefore, according to Mr. Wright, the oral lessons of catechists are the bases of our Synopti (Gospels. The "personal equation" mainly accounts for the differences.

This is, in principle, Bishop Westcott's theory in the "Introduction."

The following sentence has interested us very much. "They—*i.e.*, the first two chapters of St. Luke—can be retranslated into Hebrew much more readily than into Aramaic, and Hebrew was used by the learned as Latin is still used in University life." That is, we should say, not altogether in agreement with Professor Marshall's theory, as expounded in the *Expositor*; for, if special portions were in Hebrew, surely the common tradition also would have been.

The whole paper is very well worth a careful study.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"CHRIST'S HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH," ACCORDING TO CHURCH PRINCIPLES.

SIR,—When Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Docker write in your paper about "the Church," what it is and what it is not, I presume they mean "Christ's Holy Catholic Church"; and when Mr. Lawrence speaks of a certain theory of the Church being "inconsistent with Church principles," I presume he means by "Church principles" the principles of the Church of England.

Now it happens that we have express and documentary teaching by our Church as to what "Christ's Holy Catholic Church" is. What is called "the Bidding Prayer," or "The Form of a Prayer to be used by all Preachers before their Sermons," as embodied in the 55th Canon, begins thus: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." I do not know if Mr. Lawrence would consider this definition identical with his own, viz., "a Society of which all persons baptised are members"; but I am sure that it is heartily accepted by all Evangelicals, and that "Evangelialism" teaches it fully and freely—all the more so that it embraces non-Episcopalians as well as Episcopalians, the Church of Scotland in 1603, as well as before that date—the date of the Canons—and ever since, being Presbyterian in its mode of government. I think myself that the Church's definition and Mr. Lawrence's differ greatly. Certainly "all persons baptised" are not "Christian people." Some of them neither profess nor call themselves "Christian people." Some would be deeply offended if they were called "Christian people"; some are rank infidels, some utter atheists; many of them the greatest rascals on the face of the earth.

Of course, "all persons baptised" ought to be "Christian people"; and all such who have not openly, or *de facto*, apostatised are *supposed* to be "Christian people"; but many who are charitably or legally supposed to be such are really not such, and surely the Bidding Prayer means by "Christian people" those who are really such—those who (see 1 John ii. 19) are not only *with* Christ's disciples, but *of* them; not those who, though *with* them, as St. Augustine puts it, by partaking of sacraments, are not *of* them.

Of course, too, in dealing with local or particular

Churches, for legislation, or government, or any other purpose, we must take men on their profession of membership. Not so, I consider, when thinking of, or praying for, or believing in, the Holy Catholic Church, with which we can have no dealing in any such way, and which is a Divine fact for us to believe in, and to assert each of us our individual connection with it.

In fact, the Holy Catholic Church of the Bidding Prayer, of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and I would also say of the Creeds, is all wheat and no tares, while particular, local, Churches are composed of both wheat and tares, as they are in the field. The aggregate of the Churches is Christendom, but not the Holy Catholic Church. How can "the Church" be "the plan" which Mr. Docker takes it to be?

W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas Vicarage,
February 9th, 1895.

SIR,—I am asked for Scripture authority for saying that the Church is a society founded on the Day of Pentecost, of which society all persons baptised are members. I ask, in reply—if reply be required—for Scripture authority for any other opinion or view concerning this.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

February 9th.

DISESTABLISHMENT.

SIR,—The *Standard* of the 19th inst. gives a report of Lord Rosebery's speech delivered lately at Cardiff. The right hon. gentleman said much on the question of disestablishment, but I fail to notice anything which would justify its acceptance as being favourable to the nation's good advancement. I copy the following extract from the division of the speech under the heading "Disestablishment":—

"To my mind the Church and the Establishment are two perfectly distinct affairs. The Church is too high for me to discuss to-night; the Establishment is not too high. An ecclesiastical establishment, like other establishments, must rest upon the deliberate will of the people, or it rests upon nothing. That I believe to be sound doctrine, and the basis on which the Irish Church was disestablished."

Now it appears to me that this is a very poor line of reasoning to decide upon the all-important question of the Church, which must, to ensure a people's well-being, receive their first consideration that its laws may be obeyed. For instance, let me ask, what is the meaning of Church Establishment? Is it not the acknowledging, by the law of the nation, the conforming to the teaching of the Church, as the only means by which the true prosperity of a people can be maintained? Was it not departing from this rule that brought the great trouble and suffering upon the Israelites? Man fell into evil hands, and the Lord provided a law to raise him again to a state of virtue; and of course, to secure man's redemption from evil, that law must be duly acknowledged by him. And this, according to Bible history, is man's position at the present day. Well, then, may rulers provide a Church Establishment, that the people may be kept well in remembrance of their true position in this mysterious life, and choose the good and refuse the evil (2 Peter i. 12, 13). "The throne is established by righteousness" (Prov. xvi. 12); therefore righteousness must flow from the throne to secure peace and prosperity to an earthly kingdom; and how this can be better done than by keeping the Bible forward by which to regulate its laws it is for the advocates of disestablishment to clearly explain. Merely to denounce is not a logical position by which to acquire the good; there must be a corresponding amount of healthy argument.

His Lordship told the meeting, "The Church is too high for me to discuss to-night." I should think that the Schoolmen will greatly object to this statement as being logical. The speaker is discussing the propriety of Church Establishment; should he not, then, to do so successfully, be well acquainted with the Church in all its bearings? I should say, as a learner myself, he ought to be, particularly so as one filling a leading position in directing the affairs of a great empire. Let us observe what St. Paul teaches at Hebrews vii. 7: "And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better."

I now come to the last clause in the extract, namely, "An ecclesiastical establishment, like all other establishments, must rest upon the deliberate will of the people, or it rests upon nothing. That I believe to be sound doctrine; that was the doctrine and the basis on which the Irish Church was disestablished." If there is any one point for politicians to be on their guard to ensure a truly paternal government, it is for them to be watchful not to be led away from the course of divine justice by trusting too much to the popular will. The will of the people has to be compared with the righteous will of God, and only as it agrees therewith should it be followed. St. Paul's words at Romans xv. 2, may be useful to us here: "Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification." King Saul, in his day, obeyed the voice of the people, without paying sufficient attention to the commandment of the Lord, and through his disobedience of the Divine will he lost his kingdom. And Aaron, too, obeyed the voice of the people in setting up a molten calf, and we learn from history the trouble and calamity which came upon the Israelites. Let us weigh well the words recorded in Isaiah li. 12: "I, even I, am He that comforteth you; who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass?"

I think I have written sufficient on this occasion to show that Lord Rosebery's views on disestablishment are not of a flourishing kind to raise the nation to a state of greater enlightenment, and to promote the good advancement of the people.

J. T. DOCKER.

Worthing, January, 1895.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Flight into Egypt. Read Matt. ii. 13-23. Introduction.—When the wise men went back to their home another way, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, telling him to make haste and take the infant Jesus and His mother and flee into Egypt, and remain there until he was further instructed, for Herod intended to destroy Jesus. How wonderfully God works! He thus frustrates the designs of man, and makes him an insignificant worm—yes, just as powerless, just as harmless. Joseph and Mary instantly obeyed. Yes, by night, we are told, they departed into

Egypt, and were there until the death of this tyrant and cruel murderer of the babes of Bethlehem (read verses 13-16). After this, behold, an angel came to Joseph, saying, Arise and take the young child and his mother and go into the land of Israel, for they are dead which sought the young child's life. Thus we see how everything was accomplished in accordance with Divine interposition, and thus, we are furthermore told by the sacred historian, Jesus dwelt in Nazareth. Thus the demonstrations of revelation are fulfilled with wonderful accuracy, and man, with all his boasted wisdom and intrigue, is nothing—yea, absolutely nothing, in His hands. We may learn a few practical inferences from this subject :—1. God can never err. He is all wisdom ; He can put man to flight ; He can cast down ; He can humble the proudest and the most haughty. 2. Learn to obey the Word of God. Those that set at nought His Word will find their mistake and will be put to confusion. 3. Evil men are put to shame by God. The wicked are taken in their own craftiness. 4. God will take care of His own wherever they are, no matter the geographical or any other circumstances. 5. Good purposes must be carried out. All things work together for good to those that love Him and trust Him. Seek Christ now.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

THE Dean of Lichfield, Dr. Luckock, who has been suffering much this winter, is ordered to a warmer climate. He will be unable in consequence to make any engagements either to speak or preach till after Easter.

ALTHOUGH the Bishop of Bedford has returned to London this week from Bournemouth, he is still far from well. The doctors will not allow him to attend to any public duty at present. Dr. Billing's long illness has thrown a great deal of work upon the Bishops of London and Marlborough, as they have to divide the confirmations of the season between them.

DR. MACLAGAN, having appointed an Evangelical to the archdeaconry of Sheffield, is holding the balance even by promoting to the vacated canonry and prebend of Husthwaite in York Cathedral the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, rector of Kirby-Misperton. Mr. Hutchings is an extreme High Churchman. His predecessor in the Rectory of Kirby was Canon Body.

THE Rev. George Prescott, who has been vicar of St. Michael and All Angels', Paddington, since its foundation thirty-one years ago, has been elected Rural Dean of Paddington, in succession to Prebendary Daniel Moore, who has resigned. Mr. Prescott has been an incumbent in Paddington for a longer period than any of his brother clergy.

THE Christian Social Union has arranged two courses of sermons on social subjects for the approaching Lent. One course will be delivered at St. Edmund the King, Lombard Street, and the other at St. Mary-le-Strand. In the list of preachers in the former course is the Archbishop of Canterbury, who will speak of "A National Church" on March 12th.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Brown, Rev. Albert Edward, Curate ; Vicar of Longnor, Buxton.

Carpenter, Rev. A. Boyd, M.A., Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury ; to the Golden Lectureship.

Channer, Rev. E. C., M.A., Vicar of Ravensthorpe ; Secretary of the National Society for Haddon Deanery (First Portion).

Cleworth, Rev. T. E., Rector of Middleton ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.

Coldham, Rev. H. R. ; Vicar of Christ Church, Tunstall.

Copeland, Rev. F. G., late Curate of All Saints', Hobart ; to the Charge of the District of Zeehan.

Easton, Rev. I., Rector of Flordon ; Secretary of the National Society for Humbleyard Deanery.

Ellis, Rev. Philip, M.A. ; Vicar of Kirk Whelpington, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Ferrar, Rev. William John, B.A. ; Rector of West Barkwith, Wragby, Lincolnshire.

Ford, Rev. Edward, M.A. ; Vicar of Albrighton, Shrewsbury.

Halford, Rev. G. D., M.A., Curate of Bishop Auckland ; Vicar of St. Peter's, Jarrow.

Hedges, Rev. T. T. ; Rector of Springthorpe, Gainsborough.

Hindley, Rev. William George, Incumbent of Holy Trinity, East Melbourne ; Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Kew, Diocese of Melbourne.

Hurst, Rev. William, M.A. ; Vicar of Ramsey St. Michael's, Essex.

Jacka, Rev. Vivian T., B.A. ; Missions to Seamen Chaplain for the Shipping at the Hartlepools.

Lambert, Rev. C. G., Vicar of Temple St. Catherine's, Cornwall.

Lillingston, Rev. A. B. G., M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Onslow-square : Vicar of Christ Church, Blackburn.

Macdonald, Rev. F. W., M.A., Vicar of Stapleford ; Rector of Wishford Magna, Salisbury.

Morgan, Rev. John M., Curate of St. David's, Liverpool ; Vicar of St. Dogmael, Pembrokeshire.

Neale, Rev. John, B.A. ; Vicar of Harmston, Lincoln.

Ormsby, Rev. William Knox, Vicar of Hopton ; General Secretary of the Norwich Diocesan Church Building Society.

Orton, Rev. J. W., L.Th., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Oldham ; Examiner of Religious Instruction under the Oldham School Board.

Prescott, Rev. George Frederick, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels', Star-street ; Rural Dean of Paddington.

Richardson, Rev. Edward Shaw, B.A., Rector of St. Paul's, Hulme, Manchester ; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Bolton.

Rowe, Rev. G. F. Handel, B.A., Curate ; Vicar of St. Augustine's, Halifax.

Saunders-Jones, Rev. D., M.A., Rector of Llanfrynach ; Secretary of the National Society for Brecon Deanery (Three Parts).

Sharpe, Rev. Henry Edmund, M.A., Vicar of Whitchurch, Hants ; Vicar of Newport, Isle of Wight.

Smith, Rev. G., Chaplain to the Forces Third Class ; Chaplain to the Forces Second Class.

Spain, Rev. Thomas Dixon ; Rector of Rand-cum-Fulnetby, Wragby.

Thompson, Rev. J. Denton, M.A., Rector of North Meols ; Secretary of the National Society for North Meols Deanery.

Tyrer, Rev. Frank Barker, M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour's, Everton ; Rural Dean of Walton.

Vincent, Rev. G. H , M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Walham-green ; Chaplain to the Sisterhood of St. Katharine's, Normand-road, Fulham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ash, Rev. Jarvis Holland, D.C.L., at Hungershall Park, Tunbridge Wells, on the 7th inst., aged 82.

Beauchamp, Rev. R. W., Rector of Wickmere, at The Anchorage, London-road, Reading, on the 8th inst., aged 81.

Gardner, Rev. John Ludford, M.A., at Leamington, on the 29th ult., aged 61.

Ludgater, Rev. Henry, for over fifty years Rector of the Parish, at the Rectory, Aythorpe-Roding, Essex, on the 3rd inst., aged 80.

Orde, Rev. Leonard Shafto, M.A., of Weetwood, at Shorestone Hall, Chathill, on the 9th inst., aged 87.

Randall, Rev. John Montague, forty-four years Vicar of Langham, Norfolk, at Lowestoft, on the 2nd inst., aged 76.

Salwey, Rev. Richard, for fifty-four years Rector of Ash, Sevenoaks, at Stonehouse Court, Gloucestershire, on the 6th inst., aged 94.

Wood, Rev. William, M.A., twenty-six years Rector of the parish, at the Rectory, Thorpe, Notts, on the 1st inst., aged 62.

The Church of England Pulpit.

ROMAN CLAIMS.

By the Right Rev. the Bishop of Manchester.

Sermon Preached in Manchester Cathedral on Sunday, January 20th, 1895.

In continuing the discussion of the questions—raised at the recent diocesan conference—as to what evidence there was either that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, or that his prerogatives as Apostle, whatever they might be, descended to his alleged successors in that see, the Bishop said that St. Jerome, in his lives of illustrious men, made the statement that :—

> Simon Peter . . . . himself chief of the Apostles, after having been Bishop of the Church of Antioch . . . . pushed on to Rome in the second year of Claudius (*i.e.*, A.D. 42), and held the sacerdotal chair there for twenty-five years.

In these words he stated the belief of the Church of Rome. Let them ask what historical basis there was for it. It was plainly inconsistent with the Scriptural notices of the period referred to. In the year A.D. 58, that was sixteen years after St. Peter was supposed to have become Bishop of Rome, St. Paul wrote a letter to the Romans. In that letter he said :—

> So have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation ; but as it is written, To whom He was not spoken of they shall see, and they that have not heard shall understand.—Rom. xv. 20, 21.

That was the Apostle's practice. If, then, St. Peter had been Bishop of Rome for sixteen years, they might be sure that he would not go to Rome to preach the Gospel and to impart to them Apostolic gifts. Yet this was precisely what he said he hoped to do :—

> For I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established.—Rom. i. 11.

This compelled them to strike out sixteen years of St. Peter's supposed episcopate. Next they might be pretty sure that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome before the end of St. Paul's imprisonment in that city, viz., before A.D. 63, for during that imprisonment St. Paul wrote many letters to Gentile Churches and to individuals. In these, especially in his letter to the Colossians, greetings were sent to his correspondents from saints in Rome, but no mention of any kind was made of St. Peter, who, whether present or absent must, according to the Roman hypothesis, have been the believer of most power and influence in the Church. This was to him inconceivable. And thus once more they must strike out five additional years from St. Peter's supposed episcopate. During twenty-one, then, out of the twenty-five years, he certainly was not Bishop of Rome. But if they came to such a conclusion as this, of what value could they hold that testimony to be which contained as an essential part of it the statement that St. Peter's episcopate lasted for twenty-five years? Roman apologists had urged that the most ordinary prudential considerations must have hindered the early Christians from allowing St. Peter's movements and official acts as head of the whole Church to be made known to the heathen authorities. To that he replied that St. Paul was not writing to the heathen authorities, but to Christian Churches. Roman apologists often ignored the alleged period of St. Peter's episcopate, and contented themselves with an endeavour to establish the fact. But, indeed, the bare fact was only one degree less improbable than its alleged duration, for it was utterly inconsistent with all which they knew of the general character of St. Peter's ministry. The Bishop pointed to many passages of Holy Scripture as showing that the hypothesis of St. Peter's bishopric of Rome was inconsistent. Were there, he asked, any Scriptural expressions which looked the other way? There was not one. The only expressions to which he had seen reference made were not alleged to prove that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, but only founder of the Church there. As, however, they were cited to exclude St. Paul as a founder, they, perhaps, deserved examination. The assertion that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome was opposed by the earliest and most reliable records of ecclesiastical history. The very earliest reference to St. Peter's work at Rome was made by D onysius, Bishop of Corinth, about 170 A.D. He said, in a letter written to the Roman Church :—

> You have by such an admonition bound together the planting of Peter and of Paul at Rome and Corinth. For both of them planted and likewise taught us in our Corinth. And they taught together in like manner in Italy, and suffered martyrdom at the same time.—Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 25.

That was in many ways a very remarkable passage. It showed the looseness with which the earliest Fathers used such words as "founder" and "founding"; and so loose a usage of words showed them how cautious they should be in interpreting such words too strictly. Again, the planting of Peter and Paul was said to be the same at Rome and at Corinth. But who ever argued that, because St. Peter and St. Paul planted the Church at Corinth, either of them was Bishop of Corinth? If such phrases showed that either of them was a Bishop of Rome or of Corinth, they showed that both were—a thing impossible in the early ages.

Again, Tertullian, writing about thirty years later, told us that, "As the Church of Smyrna recounteth that Polycarp was placed there by John," so "that of Rome doth that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter." (*De Praescript. Haer.* xxxii.) His only remark on that point was that Tertullian knew no relation between Peter and Clement which was not equally true of that between John and Polycarp. But who ever thought that, because John ordained Polycarp, therefore John was Bishop of Smyrna? Why, then, should it be assumed that because Peter ordained Clement he was Bishop of Rome? In his address to the Diocesan Conference he quoted a passage of Irenæus in which they found the same relation preserved between the two great Apostles of the Roman see. Irenæus told them that—

> The blessed Apostles, having founded and built the Church, committed the episcopal office to Linus. To him succeeded Anancletus (elsewhere called Cletus, or Anacletus), and after him Clement succeeded, in the third place from the Apostles.—*Haer.* iii.3.

They had seen what Irenæus meant by "founded." He meant that the two founders, Peter and Paul, assisted in the establishment of the Roman Church. What the one did the other did; and on the authority of this passage they had no more right to say that Peter was Bishop of Rome than that Paul was. The supposition that either was was absolutely excluded by the statement that Clement was the third. Both Apostles were thus excluded from the enumeration of the Roman Bishops. That was the case in the year 180, and he (the Bishop) thought he should be able to show conclusively that all later statements that Peter was Bishop of Rome were mistakes founded on a forgery. This list of the early Roman Bishops was universally accepted as the true one. It was adopted by Eusebius, and by Jerome after him; it was accepted by Epiphanius in the East and Rufinus in the West, and was contained in the Roman liturgy to the present day. Every careful student of Patristic literature had perceived that at a very early period the mistake had in some way been introduced that Clement was ordained by St. Peter as his successor in the Roman see. Tertullian, at the beginning of the third century, had heard and believed the story. Obviously it was in direct conflict with the correct statement of the fact. St. Peter died in 67 A.D., and St. Clement became Bishop of Rome in 90 A.D. How, then, could St. Peter have ordained him twenty-three years afrer his own death? "Accordingly," says Dr. Salmon, "another list of Roman Bishops was published. which puts up Clement to the second and pushes down Anacletus to the third place" ("Infallibility," p. 355). It did more; it took Cletus and Anacletus to be two persons, instead of two names for one person, and made the imaginary addition a Bishop of Rome. No one attributed deliberate fraud to the Roman Church. The false statement was not invented by that Church, but came to it from without, and the only fault it committed consisted in the too easy acceptance of what fell in with its own desires. Its own true tradition made it impossible for it to claim St. Peter as its first Bishop. He was no more its Bishop than St. Paul was. He was pointedly excluded from the succession. But in the new story that had come to it both these difficulties were removed. St. Peter was separated from St. Paul, and he was called Bishop of Rome. Such a report was most welcome, and it was eagerly received. No doubt it created immense difficulties, but difficulties might be met by more or less ingenious speculations. If the chronological difficulty was urged that St. Peter could not consecrate a bishop after his own death, they had the answer of Platina that St. Peter—

> Had, as it were, by will bequeathed the right of succession (to St. Clement). Yet his modesty was so great that he compelled Linus and Cletus to take upon them the Pontifical dignity before him.—*Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. : Linus.

The idea of one bishop ordaining another by will was certainly startling and unprecedented. A far more possible explanation was that of the "Liber Pontificalis," that Linus and Cletus were appointed by St. Peter during his lifetime to act as his suffragans. This explanation was current nearly three hundred years before, and was repeated by Rufinus, who said:—

> Linus and Cletus were, no doubt, Bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, but this was in St. Peter's lifetime; that was, they took charge of the episcopal work, while he discharged the duties of the Apostolate.—Preface to *Clement's Recognitions.*

This, however, was no explanation, for the authentic lists of the Roman episcopate made them diocesans, and not suffragans, assigning to them their own special periods of office as Bishops of Rome. Epiphanius imagined that both St. Peter and St. Paul were Bishops of Rome, and that it was a common practice in the Church to support two bishops in one city where there were communities of Jews and Gentiles. These two latter explanations had been combined by modern Roman apologists. Who, however, could imagine for a moment that St. Paul would take part in an arrangement which, by separating Jews and Gentiles, would favour what to him was the heresy of heresies, that in Christ there was any distinction between them? Obviously all these so-called explanations were mere evasions, to get rid of a difficulty which obstinately refused to disappear. When an historical critic found himself confronted by such difficulties and such evasions, he knew that he was in the near neighbourhood of mistakes and fictions, and he looked carefully round for their origin. In this case he would not have to look far, for he soon found that, at the very time when Clement began first to be called St. Peter's successor, that romance was published which was known as the "Clementine Homilies and Recog-

nitions." The writer of the preface made Clement give an account of his ordination, and here for the first time they had mention made of St. Peter as sole Bishop of Rome, and of the chair of that bishopric as St. Peter's chair. St. Paul's name was excluded as a founder because the author of the romance was an Ebionite who hated St. Paul and all his works; but those who wished to make the Church there "the mother and mistress of all Churches" were not likely to inquire too closely into the origin of this proceeding. They found what they wanted—the assertion that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome—and, whatever chronological difficulties might be created by the statement that St. Peter ordained Clement, they eagerly accepted what they found. There were several things, however, contained in the Clementines respecting which Roman apologists were silent. First, they never quoted the first paragraph of that epistle, which made St. James, and not St. Peter, Bishop of Bishops. They never, again, referred to those passages of the same work where St. James was made to require from St. Peter an annual report of all his discourses and acts, or where St. Peter was made to say, "While we abode at Jericho . . . . . James, the Bishop, sent for me, and sent me here to Cæsarea." Again, while the Clementine assertion that the see of Rome was "St. Peter's own chair" was constantly repeated by subsequent writers, a significant silence was preserved as to another Clementine report. They were told that when St. Peter left the Church of Cæsarea, to which St. James had sent him, "He laid his hands upon Zacchæus, who had stood by, and forced him to sit down in his own chair" ("Homilies" i ii. 63). If, then, the expression "his own chair" proved St. Peter to have been Bishop, he was Bishop of Cæsarea. And, again, if setting a man "in his own chair" gave to a bishop all the prerogatives of St. Peter, then assuredly all the prerogatives of St. Peter belonged to the Bishops of Cæsarea. If it were urged that the Clementine homilies were simply a romance without historical foundation, he answered that it was historically certain that this romance was the very foundation of the Petrine claims of Rome. Before their publication they heard nothing of St. Peter's sole episcopate, and nothing of Rome as being his see. St. Peter was a founder of the Church of Rome along with St. Paul, but never sole Bishop. How this Clementine fiction came to be first received as serious history we could not tell; it was probably rather from ignorance than from a desire to deceive. Certain it was that we found traces of its influence in many quarters from the early years of the third century. Rufinus, who in the first eight years of the fifth century translated the Clementines, referred to those works without a suspicion of their apocryphal character. In the year 1479 Bartholomew Platina, superintendent of the Vatican Library, published, at the request of Pope Sixtus IV., his "Lives of the Popes," and in his life of St. Peter it was easy to recognise in those words a free paraphrase of the Preface to the Clementines; and that Platina accepted this Preface as genuine history was evident from his life of St. Clement. Platina quoted the words of the Clementine Preface freely, as did the "Liber Pontificalis." This made it probable that he quoted or paraphrased from this latter work—a conclusion to which we should also be led by his frequent appeals to the authority of Pope Damasus. For there appeared as a preface to the "Liber Pontificalis" two forged letters, from Damasus to Jerome, and from Jerome to Damasus, to which Platina referred as genuine in his life of this Pope. And now who could doubt that the whole confusion of the Roman lists, and the whole early persuasion of St. Peter's Roman episcopate, were due to the acceptance in the third and following centuries of the Clementine fiction as genuine history? So that if they had to conclude, as he believed every honest historical critic must conclude, that the Roman episcopate of St. Peter was nothing better than a fable based upon a fiction, then what became of the claim of the Bishop of Rome that he inherited from St. Peter the right to be the supreme ruler and the infallible teacher of all Christian Churches? How could he inherit, as Bishop of Rome, from one who never was Bishop of Rome? The Liberian catalogue was a mistake, the Clementine Preface was a fiction; there was only one true tradition—that of Irenæus. And if St. Peter were not Bishop of Rome, then the foundation-stone of the vast structure of Roman supremacy was knocked away, and the whole building must crumble into ruins. Again, if the Clementine fiction were received as history, of what value or authority could the assertion of St. Peter's Roman episcopate be by the authors of later date? They did but repeat a mistaken tradition, and had no more authority than the fiction upon which that tradition was based. Not that on that account he expected to see those assertions abandoned by Roman apologists. They would be repeated in the future, he knew, with an audacity in no wise diminished by the discovery of their apocryphal foundation. Great was the might of unwearied repetition. It bore to the earth as with the force of a dead mechanical weight the spirit of the ignorant and thoughtless. It was the force of political war cries, which, shouted as they were year after year from a thousand platforms, appeared to the vulgar to be eternal truths. But, however long might be the reign of falsehood, it was doomed to final discomfiture. "Magna est veritas et prævalebit." Let them only possess their souls in patience, and in God's time this portentous falsehood of St. Peter's Roman episcopate, with all the far-reaching results of usurpation and superstition which it carried, would pass into impotence and oblivion.

THE HEBREW PROPHET'S LESSON TO ENGLAND.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Honorary Canon of Manchester.

Sermon Preached at Yardley, near Birmingham, for the Bishop of Worcester's Church Extension Society, on Sunday, January 25th, 1895.

"Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy."—Isaiah lxv. 17, 18.

THE Church wisely presents to us for our meditation, at this season of the year, many of the noble utterances of the Hebrew prophets, and especially of Isaiah, the greatest of them all. Let us consider to-day, first, the position and office of the Hebrew prophet, and, secondly, the general contents and substance of his visions, or at least of that part of them which took a wider view than the mere temporary relations of his own time; and, lastly, let us apply what these considerations may bring to our minds to the special circumstances of our own Church, and nation, and times, and also to the limited local efforts which form the special subject of the day.

I. The position of the Hebrew prophet was entirely outside of the sacerdotal system of his nation. He might, indeed, be a priest, as were Jeremiah and Ezekiel; but, even in such cases, his call was independent of the sons of Aaron, his spirit was not conveyed to him through their hands, and his prophetic functions were exercised apart from the temple in which they ministered. When his call was conveyed to him by the voice of another human being, it was addressed to him by a person of his own order, as by Elijah to Elisha. In some cases he was educated for his office in those prophetic communities which existed in Israel from the days of Samuel downwards. But sometimes also he was, like Amos, neither originally a prophet nor a prophet's son, but merely a herder of cattle and a gatherer of wild fruits, whom the Lord took as he followed the flock, and said to him, "Go, prophesy unto My people Israel." The essential point in his character was that he was in immediate relation with the Deity, whose vision he saw and whose words he heard.

Sometimes he was, as in the case of the prophet Haggai, a close ally of the priests, and zealous in supporting that external service of which they were the ministers, and in building and adorning those material sanctuaries which were then, as now and always, the priest's first and greatest care. But oftener his call compelled him to protest against their localisation of the Deity: "Heaven is my throne," he was bid to say, "and earth is my footstool. Where is the house ye build unto me, and where is the place of my rest?" And he had to press upon them the truth, which is everywhere professed, but in practice constantly neglected, that God's worship and service consists not in ceremonial, but in holy life and in works of charity. He was bidden to say words like these, which we heard addressed to us afresh on the first Advent Sunday. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? saith the Lord. When ye come to appear before Me, who hath required this at your hands to tread My courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto Me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with: it is iniquity, even your solemn meeting.

The prophet was not always true to his high calling. Sometimes there came a miserable period when both forms of Divine ministry alike forgot their call and the Caller. Then the prophets prophesied falsely, and the priests bore rule through their means; and in that arrangement the people acquiesced. That appeared to Jeremiah a wonderful and horrible thing, premonitory of an approaching end, or catastrophe, as indeed it was.

But for the most part the Hebrew prophet was mindful of his position and true to his call. He supplied that necessary correction from outside which all established clergy require, and none more than ourselves, though few have ever the wisdom to know and confess that they require it. It is that very correction and control which is irregularly exercised in our time and over us, partly by the writings of the men of literature and science, partly by the confused utterances of the magazines and newspapers, partly by the many voices of Nonconformity, and generally and in a variety of forms by the public opinion of the day.

II. When the Hebrew prophet was at his best and highest, it was a very noble message of God that was conveyed through his lips.

The exciting cause of his vision or dream was a deep consciousness of the evil and misery of his own times. He saw around him intemperance and vice—among the rich the self-indulgence of overabundance, and among the poor the self-indulgence of despair. He saw oppression and injustice exercised by those in power and suffered by the weak and poor. His country was constantly suffering under the bloodshed and devastation of war. Meanwhile, the religion which ought to have corrected all these evils was gone astray, and was spending itself in sensuous idolatries. The Deity Himself was looked upon as one who might be bribed by costly sacrifices and propitiated by gorgeous ritual, as one who excited the ambitious chief to war and rewarded him with victory. In the midst of all these evils the prophet dreamt of a new heavens and a new earth in which should dwell only righteousness, in which self-indulgent luxury should cease, in which the weak and the poor should be protected by the strong and rich,

in which the powerful should only use his power to support the tottering and lift up the fallen, in which there should be no more violence and oppression, and, above all, no more war. They dreamt that Israel and Jerusalem would become the centre of such a new world. This was the glory that they hoped for their nation, this their lofty patriotism. And in their nation a son of David was to arise to become its prince and king; and He was to extend this kingdom of righteousness till the whole earth was filled with that knowledge of the Lord which the new Israel would possess, even as the waters covered the sea. They hoped to see this dream of theirs realised in their own time.

And now more than twenty-five centuries have passed since the time when Isaiah prophesied, almost nineteen centuries since the time when the Son of David came, and the dream is not realised yet. There is still intemperance and vice, still misery and oppression, still weak who might be strengthened, fallen who might be raised, wanderers who might be reclaimed. Nation still lifts up sword against nation. And those very people who look on the utterances of the Hebrew prophets as the word of God, and who celebrate the advent of a Prince of Peace, are also those who have perfected the art of war, and have thereby organised murder on a gigantic scale, such as the Sennacheribs and Nebuchadnezzars of old time never imagined in their wildest dreams of conquest and rapine. There could not be a bitterer satire on Christianity than that sight which we are every day witnessing in the far East—two non-Christian nations daily slaughtering one another, having learnt the cruel art that they are practising entirely from us Christians.

III. Is, then, the dream of the Hebrew prophets, and of Him who, in one of His high offices, was the last and greatest of them—that is, the Christ Himself, never to be more than a dream, and is their ideal incapable of being ever realised on earth? Have we not all an inward consciousneas that we ought not to surrender to any such suggestions of despair?

Let us place before our minds once more what that ideal was. A native country of their own, in which justice and charity should reign, the classes not preying on one another, nor contending, but helping one another, the destitute and suffering cared for, the weak protected by the strong, all classes alike lifted out of intemperance and vice; and then this native country, thus purified and elevated, acting as an ever-wideniug influence on the world, and extinguishing everywhere injustice, cruelty, bloodshed, and war.

That was their dream for Israel, and that ought to be our dream for England now; and we have reason to hope that the dream is gaining substance, and that it will shortly be something more than a dream. That internal condition of the people, ndustrial, social, and religious, the elevation of which is the one necessary condition of all saving influence abroad, is now receiving a careful and exhaustive study, such as it never received before. The physicians of the nation's sicknesses are seeking for the remedies, which by God's grace they will find, if only that grace enables them to keep their own motives pure. They, and we, if we would give their enterprises any effectual aid, must make it our chief effort to keep ourselves clear from both the twin forms of egotism—the egotism of personal interest and ambition, and the egotism of party, whether political or ecclesiastical. These are the two perversions which are apt to dim the sight, and to deflect the aim, of those who are seeking the highest good of their fellow-creatures. Let us banish these two evil things, and then we may hope to see growing up amongst us that kingdom of which the prophets dreamt—one of moral virtue, of order, of justice, of charity, of peace, and through these even of material well-being. And if this be so, then we may also hope to see that wide-spreading national influence pleading for world-wide justice and peace, of which they also dreamed. A loud and general demand, rising out of the deepest heart of the nation, will constrain those in whose hands is political power to use their utmost efforts to devise a means by which questions between nations may be referred to the arbitrament of a supreme court of international justice, instead of to the brutal decision of battle.

Virtue, justice, and charity at home, and peace throughout the world—an aspiration for those things was the lofty patriotism of the Hebrew prophet. And that ought to be ours.

I think that we are awaking gradually to a consciousness of the great enterprise which lies in front of the England of to-day. It is not a political enterprise in the sense of a remodelling of our form of government on freer and more popular lines. That work is already practically completed. It is not an enterprise of denominational religion—an effort to secure the ascendancy of this or that body of professing Christians, or of this or that school of thought. For we are gradually recognising the truth, that men's minds are very various, and that as long as there is free thought and truthful speech there must be differences of opinion, and that such differences ought not to be suppressed, or silenced, or coerced. If ever we influence our brother to profess what he does not believe, we pervert his conscience and destroy his mental and spiritual truthfulness. There must be differences, and perhaps there must be also separate communions, in which these differences of opinion may be confessed and promulgated.

But the enterprise which lies before our age is one in which all may combine. It is the elevation and improvement of the whole body of the people, material and moral, and eventually spiritual also. There are huge masses of population, all our

fellow-creatures, all professedly our Christian brethren, depressed and degraded and dependent, eating and drinking when they can get the means to eat and drink, because to-day is wretched and hopeless, and to-morrow they must die. To hold out hope to these, to improve their lot in life, and thus to awaken in them nobler aspirations—this is the great enterprise of our time. The highest form of patriotism is to claim for England the leading part in this. While other nations are devising improved weapons of destruction and perfecting the art of war, let the deepest thoughts of all our highest minds be occupied on the effort to improve the conditions of life for our people, and so to make them better and happier.

This was what the prophets hoped for their nation, their Israel or their Judah. But they had also a still more local patriotism, which was centred in their capital city. Comfortable words were to be spoken to Jerusalem; that city was to be a quiet habitation, a rejoicing, a praise. For Zion's sake the prophet would not hold his peace, and for Jerusalem's sake he would not rest until the righteousness thereof should go forth as brightness, and her salvation as a lamp that burneth, so that the nations should see her righteousness and all the kings her glory.

IV. This consideration of the Prophet's local patriotism brings us nearer to the local effort which you have immediately in hand. The great city, to which I suppose you feel yourselves becoming more and more a dependent suburb, is one which, to those who look upon it from a distance, seems to possess a very remarkable history. I cannot say that, like Jerusalem of old, Birmingham is renowned throughout our country for its sanctity. Its achievements are of a different kind, but they are great. I am old enough to remember the times of 1832, when, as a boy returning home from school, I saw the town and neighbourhood, and especially the black country beyond, decorated from end to end with flags in celebration of the great struggle and victory of Reform. In winning that victory this metropolis of the Midlands had played the leading part. Again, in the great question about the Union, which was at issue in 1886, and again in 1892, and is not yet quite closed, whatever opinion may be held of its merits, none can doubt that the stedfastness of Birmingham is the weight which has turned, and is turning the scale. Once more, this city is pointed to on all sides as the place where municipal government has been most successful in promoting the welfare of the population. It is a grand record, as far as it has already gone. But there are greater questions now arising, and a work waiting to be done, which is greater far, and also more near akin to the spirit of Hebrew prophecy. This is the improvement of the condition of the whole people in all things that relate both to life and to godliness. I hope and believe that the public mind is turning from the miserable struggles of the politicians to this nobler and more fruitful work; and there are signs that in this also your city and neighbourhood is destined to play a leading part. It would be a crowning triumph if the still missing means of elevating the people might also proceed from hence.

The mind of the politician, whether national or municipal, must ever be occupied chiefly with material measures. And it is perhaps a fact, that the history of this city and neighbourhood records, thus far, too exclusively material achievements. But it may be hoped that its moral and spiritual victories are yet to come. While its citizens are labouring to promote the material welfare of those classes which most need help, there are also needed voices, like those of the Hebrew prophets, whose special call it is to protest that the thoughts of active philanthropists must not be entirely occupied by mere material things. As Isaiah says in one place, "I have set watchmen on thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night: ye that make mention of the Lord keep not still, silence, and give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem (*here* that should be read Birmingham) a praise in the earth." Amidst the efforts that are being made, and will be made more constantly, to enable men to earn more easily and more plentifully the bread of this world, voices will be urgently required to protest to him that he doth not live by bread alone. Amidst all the measures that will be devised to promote material prosperity, and amidst the multitudes who are and will be hasting to be rich, constant remembrances will be always needed to prevent men's minds from being exclusively occupied with the world and the flesh, and thus falling a victim to that power of evil, which we are wont to personify under the name of the devil.

Here is the point where the work of Christian agencies comes in like that whose cause we are pleading to-day. Its duty is to plead for higher life and nobler aims than those contained in the mere pursuit of material prosperity. It must preach Christ, that is, self-sacrifice, self-devotion, love. To those who are absorbed in the eager pursuit of money it must teach and show that it is more blessed to give than to receive, more happy to labour for the good of others than to acquire worldly goods for ourselves; a nobler thing to serve than to be served.

This work of directing minds to the highest aims requires the co-operation of all who are at all like-minded, whether high or low, rich or poor. The enterprise which you are being called upon to aid to-day has for its aim the thorough evangelisation of Birmingham, a work in which the National Church to which you belong must ever bear the leading part. The invitation to help that enterprise has already been addressed to the wealthier classes, and they, I have no doubt, will be found to have responded liberally to the appeal. It is now

repeated, in their turn, to those whose position in this world is humbler. They, too, are now invited to give according to their means, and thus to claim their share in the noble effort. They are ready enough to assert their claims to influence in secular things. They have their votes both in national and in local government, and thus there is no privilege of citizenship in which they do not hold a great, and even an overwhelming, share. Let them also claim their share in the moral and religious improvement of the people. They must no longer leave those efforts to depend exclusively on the contributions of the rich. Great as may be the effects produced by the few great gifts which are bestowed by wealthy donors, still greater effect is produced by a multitude of small gifts proceeding out of the self-denial of the poor. All classes now have a share of power, and the labouring class has, through its numbers, the largest share of all. That class should never forget that with power always goes responsibility. Those who hold it are answerable to God for its exercise. They must use it for goodness, for truth.

Let every class, then, down to the very humblest, claim its share in the great work of promoting its brethren's happiness through Christian faith and Christian life. They that have much should give bounteously; they that have little should do their diligence gladly to give of that little. Then, by the efforts of all combined, a great deal may be realised of the old prophet's dream. In a world like ours, in which there are so many changes and so much is new, let us all seek at least a beginning of that most blessed change of all, a new world, a new local neighbourhood—for the local work lies readiest and nearest to every hand—in which shall dwell righteousness, charity, and goodwill among all men.

READERS of that charming book, "The Harvest of a Quiet Eye," will be glad to learn that its author, the Rev. J. R. Vernon, rector of St. Audries, North Somerset, has just received preferment. He has been appointed by Bishop Kennion to a prebendal stall in Wells Cathedral.

IT is interesting to know what a leading organ of Political Dissent thinks upon the appointment to the See of Hereford. The *Christian World* calls the selection of Dr. Percival "a new sensation," and goes on to say, with excellent logic, that "a man who advocates disestablishment of part of the English Church must, of course, be prepared for the disestablishment of the remainder."

IT is to be hoped that Ipswich will soon have a bishop of its own. In the meantime the energetic Bishop of the great East Anglian diocese is doing his best for the capital of Suffolk. Dr. Sheepshanks purposes to spend the Sundays of Lent there. He will preach a course of sermons on family religion at St. Matthew's Church in the mornings, a course of evangelistic sermons in the evenings at St. Michael's, and give addresses at other churches in the afternoons.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1895.

MUCH MISUNDERSTOOD.

MR. MORLEY claims our sympathy. His attitude towards the dynamite convicts has been wholly misunderstood. He never intended to express sympathy with them, or to pledge himself to their release. For this we have now his positive assurance, and Englishmen will readily accept it. One can understand the feelings of the Irish nationalists, but it is hard to believe that any English public man could condone crimes so detestable, or excuse the criminals. It is Mr. Morley's misfortune that his peculiar cast of mind, eminently unpractical, has left him open to this misinterpretation. Nevertheless it must be confessed that Mr. Morley has been, unwittingly, his own traducer. No one can deny that the famous Leinster speech left large bodies of Irish, and many English, under the impression that the return of the Gladstonians to power would be followed by an act of amnesty and oblivion for the Dynamitards. The reason of the mistake is obvious. Mr. Morley is a philosopher, a man of abstractions. He follows principles to their logical conclusions, without considering the modifications and adaptations required to translate them into practice. He is a man of ideas, rather than a man of action. The idea of amnesty suggested to him becomes at once an affair of speculation and theory, it is taken out of the region of practice and carried into the region of mind. It is not connected with any specific persons or specific acts. Communards, Secessionists, *et id genus omne*, only figure as illustrations of an abstract principle, treated in a subjective way.

But the Irish who listened to him at Leinster were in quite a different vein. Abstract ideas were nothing to them, no more was the principle of

amnesty. What they wanted was the release of Daly & Co. That was what amnesty meant. And when Mr. Morley spoke in favour of the principle, they took him to mean this particular instance of the practice; [and the reference to Communards and Secessionists only confirmed them in their opinion. The difference between the Communards and the Dynamitards was in Mr. Morley's mind; to the Irish Nationalists they were identical. And therefore they have grievously misunderstood Mr. Morley, to his prejudice and their disappointment. On the whole, it is not surprising.

But it is surprising that Mr. Morley should not have anticipated this. He has now had considerable experience of public affairs, and it might have been supposed that he would know that abstract propositions can only be entertained by most people as far as they can be identified with concrete application. To go farther, a trained mind is required, and even educated men, as a rule, are content to confine their speculations to the limits of personal experience. It is the rarest thing in the world to hear an abstract question discussed, on its merits, outside a college debating society or combination room. Mr. Morley carries the atmosphere of the debating society on to the platform of a party meeting in Ireland, of all places in the world! It is a fault common to many advanced thinkers, who seem unable to realise that the minds of other people are on different lines to their own. But it stamps a man as more or less unpractical, and therefore, in his degree, untrustworthy and unsafe if he is placed in a position which compels him to carry his private speculations to their strict logical conclusion in his public acts. Simple people, unable to distinguish between the idealist and the Cabinet minister, between the abstract notion of crime against the State and its concrete embodiment in the persons of Daly and his fellows, will never be able to understand Mr. Morley. This explains Mr. Morley's administrative failure. He has done his best. He is the chief, perhaps the sole, conscientious Home Ruler in the Cabinet. He long ago convinced himself, by a purely abstract process of reasoning, and he has taken for granted the practical working of the conclusions he has reached. He converted Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Gladstone carried the party with him into their present *cul de sac*. And yet, though Mr. Morley is, in a sense, the very foundation of the Home Rule movement in England, there is no man in the front rank of the House of Commons who would be so little missed. His name is not associated even with the drafting of the abortive Home Rule Bill, and, as Irish Secretary, the Irish themselves admit their preference for his rival, Mr. Balfour. Nobody understands him, nobody altogether likes him. Mr. Morley's career as a statesman is a mistake, a lamentable waste of force, a loss to literature, and no gain to politics.

LIMPETS.

THE life of the limpet is summed up in one word, to cling, it is no matter to him whether the rock requires his presence or not, he has found himself there, washed by the accident of winds and tides, and there he sticks. It is his business, and he certainly deserves praise for the way he attends to it.

The present Government resembles the limpet in nothing else. Its function appears to be to cling—to office, whether it is invited to, or not. And in tenacity, or what the Scotch elder called the "gift of continuance," it rivals the limpet. Nothing short of physical force will dislodge it. But it has not the limpet's excuse. The first business of a Government is not to cling, it is supposed to have some active duties, and to carry a certain responsibility. What these duties are in the eyes of Lord Rosebery's administration, and what their sense of responsibility is, for the life of us we cannot tell. They assure us that their "primary policy" is Home Rule, and yet Home Rule does not even appear in their programme. Therefore it is not their duty to attempt to carry out their primary policy, nor are they responsible for it. Their "secondary policy" is to carry a host of measures, greater probably than could be passed by a strong Government in a new Parliament. They admit that they do not expect to pass them. Therefore their duty is not to carry out their secondary policy either. Also their policy is to "fill up the cup" of the House of Lords, with the view of ultimately condemning that assembly. This may, perhaps, be called their tertiary policy. It is not intended to come on yet, therefore the House of Lords is not as yet condemned, and ought to have a chance. In which case condemnation, being uncertain, cannot be called their policy. But the House of Lords is condemned, therefore the cup must be full, and it is no policy to over-fill it, and perhaps spill half the contents.

In other words, the Government have no policy, no duties, no responsibilities, except those of the limpet, without the limpet's apology. The limpet does his best, and angels can't do any better, but for the governors of a great empire to degrade themselves to the level of the limpet is not edifying, though it may be instructive, as an illustration, let us say, of reversion to the primitive. They are the drunken helots of party politics, a spectacle to men and angels of the degrading results of putting party before principle.

THE vicarage of Newport, in the Isle of Wight, which derives some importance from its proximity to the Queen's marine residence, has been conferred by the Bishop of Winchester upon the Rev. H. E. Sharpe, vicar of Whitchurch, Hants. The gross value of the living is under £300.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE TO THE FORE.

(*From a Correspondent.*)

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE is making great strides since the new Local Government Act has acknowledged women's fitness to vote, and to serve on public bodies, by giving them a place on Vestry, and Parish, and District Councils. Women who are educated enough to take any interest in these notable changes, ask, logically enough, why, after that, the line is to be drawn at the District Council? and no doubt it is but a step from thence to the County Council, and but another to the Imperial Council. Still, these two steps are not likely to be taken immediately, though it is absurd and undesirable that any class of ratepayers should be placed in women's present anomalous position. Duly qualified women have always had the municipal votes—about ten in number—which they are often twitted with neglecting to use. Now they are empowered, both married and single, both to vote and to serve on the Vestries. They may vote and serve on Boards of Guardians of the Poor, and married women may stand, but not vote, for the School Board. Single women ratepayers may vote, but not serve on the County Council. They may neither vote nor serve in the Imperial Council, or Parliament. These odd discrepancies make registration needlessly expensive and complicated, and it will be a good thing when the present time-wasting and money-wasting agitation ceases to be necessary.

Mrs. Haweis opened her accommodating house on the Chelsea Embankment for the first important drawing-room meeting on the subject of Women's Suffrage this year, and on Tuesday, February 19th, over three hundred people assembled, on her invitation, to hear speeches by the Right Hon. James Stansfeld (in the chair), the Countess Alice Kearney, Mrs. Haweis, Mrs. Cotterell Tupp, General Sir George Chesney, K.C.B., Mr. Atherley Jones, M.P., Mr. Walter McLaren, M.P., Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., and others who spoke on both the Liberal and Conservative sides. Some shewed that it was a truly Conservative measure to give women the Suffrage (this was the gist of Mrs. Haweis's speech), since women were only disfranchised as late as 1832 (a fact that is very little known). Others shewed that it would be a thoroughly Liberal measure, since the exclusion of a large and influential number of ratepayers is manifestly illiberal and unjust. Mr. Stansfeld urged the ladies, and especially the clergy present, who, he thought, might use their influence for good public questions, to redouble their efforts to obtain the privilege which will as inevitably be granted to women in England as it was granted to them in New Zealand, with a little more hearty pressure, and bring many desirable advantages to all classes of women, but more especially to the working women; and he pointed out that it was not women's agitation in New Zealand which won the cause, but men's agitation for what they considered due to women and an advantage to the community; and so it has proved.

Mrs. Haweis raised a hearty laugh by a rather quaint appeal to women to remember that they are claiming to recover a lost privilege, not as one sex against the other sex, since sex is itself but a fugitive and partial condition (here the double sense in which the idea can be taken struck everyone with hilarity, including the speaker herself, who disclaimed any reference to Bloomerism, adding, "but although human life, yours or mine, may be brief, the race will go on long after us, and we are human beings before we are men and women, with like needs and like interests; we must fight in this cause not for ourselves necessarily, but for those to come; and though many women do not interest themselves in the Suffrage question because they are happy women, and therefore do not feel the need of new protective laws for themselves, they ought not to selfishly forget that there are other women who are not happy, and therefore feel the need of such laws very much indeed. You are all right whilst you have nothing to complain of, but the moment a jar comes and trouble at home, or you have to earn your livelihood like women in factories, and the still-worse-off women outside factories who are sweated by the big shops, *then* you feel how little legislation at present does either to protect women or to help them to get on honestly, and how much, indeed, legislation does in the opposite direction." After many interesting and suitably brief and varied speeches (the rule at Mrs. Haweis's meetings), the meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the Chairman, and a similar one to the hostess. After tea, and before the company dispersed, Miss Romola Tynte, the charming and versatile reciter, gave a pleasing and appropriate rendering of a new American poem on the *Coming Woman.*

THE TRUE INTERPRETATION OF EVOLUTION.—The Rev. Prebendary J. W. Reynolds, who delivers a weekly science lecture at St. Anne and St. Agnes, Gresham Street, E.C. (near General Post Office) at 1.15 p.m., last Wednesday considered the above subject. He said: We think there are grounds for saying "Life began with the Protozoa, which are things of first-forms and lowest processes of vitality." The first life-order continued, but was not very long without germs appearing productive of the second. These two progressed along different lines, as they were acted on by the forces of the universe, until the highest organic point had been reached, viz., man. Man proves himself to be of higher construction than other living things in body, in mind, and in spirit. He explains them, in part understands them, as to why and how they were made. He knows them as the work of Eternal Power and Wisdom, and knows also that apart from Power, guided by Wisdom, there is no adequate explanation. The Bible gives personality to God, because that is the highest form of existence we know of, or can think of. It has been said by a recent writer, "It was one chance in a million, which neither beasts nor birds fell heir to, that pushed man onward." Chance! there was and is no chance. Otherwise, all is hollow and utterly false. Oh, the credulity, the foolery of unbelief! Who knows that bird and beast had no chance? Yet that man, being as they were, had a chance? Does such wild talk satisfy in our hours of clearness, in the time of strong and healthy intellect, and when we are most conscious of the Divine Presence? God forbid. Look within; think of Holy Scripture; ask what you have truly learned. Remember that he that is wisest is best—best in wisdom, highest in love. The royalty of his soul is in truth and purity He belongs to the true aristocracy of merit, of higher life, and is passing on to royal rank, and everlasting in the world to come, in the new and unspeakable glories of the celestial realms. The subject of next Wednesday's lecture is "The Path of Safety."

CHURCH NOTES.

THE terribly severe weather has been felt in the sphere of Church work, as well as in all other directions. It has notably diminished the Sunday and week-day congregations in London churches. At the same time, in all but the wealthiest parishes, distress, consequent upon want of employment, is being severely felt, and in some the resources at the disposal of the clergy and their district visitors have been severely taxed. There are few parishes, even in the West End, whose vicars would not now be grateful for assistance to enable them to meet the wants of their poorer parishioners, the most deserving of whom are bearing their privations in an exemplary manner. A lady district visitor of long experience has assured us that never has she encountered such distressing scenes, in the way of fireless homes and empty cupboards, as she is compelled to witness every day.

The frost has been most unfortunate for the work of the Missions which have been going on in so many London parishes lately. People cannot be expected to turn out in the early morning or late at night, as they are wont to do on such occasions, and it is matter for little surprise to hear some expressions of discouragement. Still, despite all difficulties, comparatively large congregations have been drawn together. The Kensington Mission came to a close last Tuesday, and that in Fulham and Hammersmith begins to-day (Saturday). Out of twenty-three churches and mission churches in the rural deanery, twenty-one will join in the mission. The published list of mission preachers does not contain many well-known names. Canon Bullock, of Leeds, will be at Hammersmith Parish Church, and the Rev. W. H. M. Hay Aitken at St. Matthew's, West Kensington Park.

The Lenten mid-day services at St. Paul's Cathedral have been so tardily announced that it had come to be generally believed they were going to be dropped this year. It appears, however, that this is not the fact. Services for business men will be held at St. Margaret's, Westminster, every Wednesday in Lent, at 1.15 p.m. The preachers will be Archdeacon Farrar, Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, Rev. H. G. Daniell Bainbridge, Canon Fleming, Archdeacon Sinclair, Rev. W. Page Roberts, and Canon Gore. The services will last just over half-an-hour.

There is trouble among the congregation of St. Paul's, Onslow Gardens, in consequence of their vicar, Prebendary Webb-Peploe, having been offered the vicarage of Sheffield. Mr. Webb-Peploe has been at St. Paul's since 1876, and is, as everybody knows, one of the most popular clergymen in South Kensington. He has been down to Yorkshire to reconnoitre, but has not yet given his decision.

Canon Gent, at a recent E.C.U. meeting at Richmond, observing that the whole Episcopal Bench had given a general acceptance to the scheme of the Archbishops' Committee on Church schools, made a powerful appeal to Churchmen to sink their own personal preferences for other plans, and to rally round the Bishops now that they had at last made up their minds to do something. This is sound advice, but we must agree with the *Church Times* that it was a pity Mr. Gent did not answer the objection which was raised recently in the House of Laymen to paying teachers out of the Parliamentary grant—namely, that they would thus be put in the position of civil servants, and at once the question of religious tests would come in.

This has seemed to us from the outset a fatal objection to the demand for State payment; there are others, no doubt. If teachers are paid by the State, they cannot, of course, be questioned as to their religious belief, which is all well enough in the case of board schools, but where would be the advantage of keeping up a Church school if the head master or mistress were an agnostic or a militant Nonconformist? No Government, however, is likely to entertain a proposal which would mean a very large demand upon the Treasury.

Mr. Chamberlain's letter on Welsh Disestablishment has given satisfaction (according to the Welsh correspondent of the *Record*) to neither friends nor opponents of Liberationist principles. Liberationists assert that the letter proves conclusively that Mr. Chamberlain has greatly deteriorated as a politician. In olden times he could regard a question of this nature from a loftier standpoint—the basis of great and important principles—but now he regards it from a financial attitude merely. We are also assured from the same source, that Nonconformists can entertain no hopes of assistance from him in the coming engagement. Churchmen, on the other hand (the writer adds), are inclined to discover in the letter an attempt to pave the way for its author to record his vote against the measure on its third reading—should it ever reach such a stage in the House of Commons. That, we should say, is a rather premature conclusion.

The Bishop of Lincoln has given a second donation of £450 to the Bishop's Emergency Fund, feeling, as he states in his diocesan magazine, the utmost necessity of the continued maintenance of Church schools in the diocese, and he earnestly hopes that this donation may meet with a response similar to that with which his first contribution was met, both from clergy and laity. He also desires to state that it is his intention to close this fund at the end of the present year, by which time he hopes that the emergency of the crisis will have been over-passed.

The lectures lately delivered by the Bishop of Manchester on the Papal Claims have attracted a good deal of attention among Roman Catholics, as well as among Anglicans. An answer is, we suppose, to be forthcoming, for the Bishop of Emmaus writes to say "that the silence on our side is not to be taken as any acknowledgment that we have not abundant matter wherewith to rebut the Bishop's polemic in due season."

The Bishop of Salisbury has been warmly welcomed in Australia. He preached a strong sermon in Melbourne Cathedral against Mariolatry. Dr. Wordsworth, like his father, is at once a strong High Churchman and a very decided Protestant—in the original, not in the sectarian use of the term.

Archdeacon Sinclair has been interviewed by a contributor to the *Religious Review of Reviews* upon the question of "Pleasant Sunday Afternoons," and Sunday observance in general. As might be expected, Dr. Sinclair is "not much in favour of catchpenny titles, such as P.S.A.", but the innovation on the old ways of spending the Sunday afternoon has, on the whole, his approval. The so-called P.S.A. is "really

a development of the working-men's Bible Class." "We used to have one," said the Archdeacon, "at St. Stephen's, Westminster, which was begun and matured by my curate and successor, the Rev. W. H. G. Twining. There was no music but hymns at this meeting, which we held in a large hall, but a few men who could play different instruments brought them as an accompaniment. As to the address, we often gave one on some special religious question instead of the usual exposition of the Bible. My own impression in favour of these services is very strong, and, as far as I have been able to observe them, nothing but good must come from them."

Dr. Sinclair has no objection to hard-worked men seeking rational recreation on Sunday, and he quotes Archbishop Thomson as approving the use of the cycle, provided the cyclist attends an early service before starting on his run, or arranges to worship at some country church. "I would venture to suggest," he said, "to the clergy along the great cyclists' routes to afford every facility for cyclists to attend service in their churches." On the other hand, he is severe upon people in the upper classes who impose needless labour on their servants by Sunday parties; and he regards it as "very unfortunate that the leaders of the Oxford Movement should have given an opportunity for the revival of this form of selfishness by their disparagement of Sunday as a Puritan institution."

The extent to which the practice of private confession is spreading in the Church of England is probably little appreciated by the majority of Church people. The parish magazine of Christ Church, St. Leonards, states that at least 1,000 confessions were heard by the clergy of that church in the course of last year.

The vicarage of Aston is still vacant, having been declined, after its acceptance, by the Rev. F. S. Webster. It appears that in an interview with the churchwardens, Mr. Webster expressed his intention to abolish the intoning of the prayers, and to restrict the musical part of the services to hymns, and, possibly, anthems. He was told that this would be very distasteful to the congregation, and, having consulted the Bishop of Coventry, the late vicar of the parish, on the subject, he resolved to withdraw his acceptance of the living. It is difficult to sympathise with Mr. Webster's objection to musical services — there was no quesion of ritual—but he deserves credit for refusing a post which he could not hold without doing violence to his own conscience or offending his parishioners. Such scrupulousness is rarer than it should be.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE ONE TRUE CHURCH.

SIR,—In my replying to the letter of the Rev. H. T. Hobson, published in your issue of the 16th inst., I would like him to understand that, when I write about the Church, I mean the only one true Church as placed before our race in the Holy Scriptures, to which we must not add or diminish (Deut. iv. 2: Prov. xxx 5, 6). This is a point in theology which should be clearly understood, as it is clearly stated in the 6th Article of our National Church formulary. The one true Church is wherever the Gospel is faithfully preached. When this is done in England, it is the Church at England, and so with every other country. Your correspondent brings attention to the 55th Canon, to specify the following form of prayer: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world." St. Paul went further than this, for we read at 1 Tim. ii. 1: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men." It appears to me that our prayers, to be answered, should be offered up in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture. Let us mark well, in the Old Testament, how the prayers of the faithful prophets were always offered up to God. And so also in the New Testament; for instance, at John xvi. 23, our Lord and Saviour teaches: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you."

I desire to bring very particular attention to the word "whatsoever" in this portion of God's word; and to satisfy ourselves as to the propriety of offering up all our prayers to God, I will refer to the prayer recorded at Acts iv., commencing at the 24th verse. How can we best honour the Lord? Is it not by obeying His righteous and holy Word? Yes; obedience to it by us, we may safely say, is the true way to preserve our souls from evil, and reap the varied blessings of virtue. Let us deeply reflect over what obedience to God really is. What were the words of the faithful prophet Samuel on the subject? "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry" (1 Sam. xv. 22, 23). Yes, had there been obedience to God's command delivered to our first parents, no sacrifice would have been necessary to enable our race to be redeemed from an evil state. There would have been no occasion then for our good Saviour to have suffered. I often wonder what Unitarians can make of such texts as Philippians iii. 20, 21. I would say, then, in these days of so much uncertainty, let our endeavour as a people be to love and obey God's word more and more, and so become a united people to faithfully serve each other, as St. Paul exhorts: "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves" (Philippians ii. 3).

In place of entering upon Disestablishment, which, as causing division on the Church question, is a carnal sign, let us, as a truly discerning people, honour our constitution as directed by God's word, as the first of all temporal questions, and conform closely, to use an expression of St. Paul's, "as dear children," to the teaching thereof. We cannot then, according to the teaching of Holy Scripture, fail to become a really free people; for, as our Saviour teaches, "The truth shall make you free," which truth is God's triumphant word (John viii. 32; xvii. 17). Who more skilled in the use of God's word as chief rulers than Moses and Joshua, and where in the world's history do we read of greater and more truly able politicians? If there is any deduction which can be made from the Bible with which I am particularly impressed, it is, Let the king administer righteousness, and, behold, all his enemies shall be scattered.

I will answer the reverend gentleman's question, "How can 'the Church' be 'the place' which Mr. Docker takes it to be?" by stating, Because it is the place of safety appointed by the Lord to preserve our race from evil. This question of our correspondent, to my mind, is like asking, Why is a spade called a spade? The plan is God's arrangement, and those of us who believe in it and accept it, it raises to a good spiritual life; such I believe is the power and goodness afforded to man by the aid of the one true Church.

In conclusion, I will refer to the words of the Apostles at Acts vi. 4: "But we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word." We read nothing from them about purgatory and prayers for the dead, to angels, and to saints, nor of the offering up of material sacrifices, but that the sacrifices offered up now are to be of a spiritual kind (Heb. xiii. 15; 1 Peter ii. 5).

J. T. DOCKER.

Worthing, February, 1895.

SIR,—The subterfuge by which Mr. Lawrence hopes to escape is scarcely a safe one. He said the Church was founded on the Day of Pentecost, and that baptism admitted to membership. When asked for proof, he asks in reply for Scripture authority for any other view. He doubts now that he can say this, if he have not closed every one's mouth!

Well, then, we will go a step further, and ask him to mention any words used, or facts enacted, that go to show that the Church was in any sense founded on the Day of Pentecost? We will then ask him to give us an account of any baptism, in the sense he understands it, performed on that day? Failing an answer to these two questions, it will follow that he wished, on his own *ipse dixit*, as others have done, to promulgate articles of faith!

But no, it must not be so. "To the word and to the testimony." Compare Art. VI.: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation."

A true definition of Church is not necessary as an article of faith. The one given in the Articles is sufficient for practical purposes. Further, we must get a true notion of baptism, and not suppose that the administration of the rite is sufficient.

J. T. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage,
February 16th, 1895.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Armes, Rev. G. B., Vicar of Cleator, Cumberland; Rural Dean of Whitehaven.

Atkins, Rev. L. White, Vicar of Holy Rood, Southampton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Winchester.

Atkinson, Rev. Walter Chetwynd, M.A., Vicar of Walmsley; Chaplain of the Blair Convalescent Hospital.

Berry, Rev. Digby Marsh, M.A., Incumbent of St. Thomas's, Essenden, Diocese of Melbourne; Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne.

Bouverie, Rev. Canon the Hon. B. P., M.A., Rector of Pewsey; Secretary of the National Society for Pewsey Portion, Marlborough Deanery.

Carter, Rev. F. E., M.A., Canon Missioner of Truro; Tait Missioner at Canterbury.

David, Rev. Arthur Evan, M.A., Canon of St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane; Archdeacon of Brisbane.

Farquhar, Rev. W. M.; Minister of Parish Chapel, St. Marylebone.

Foster, Rev. A. E.; Vicar of Christ Church, Richmond, Surrey.

Gaul, Rev. Charles Ernest, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.

Gillam, Rev. Edward Isaac, M.A.; Vicar of Blewbury, Berks.

Hearn, Rev. Thomas John, M.A., Rector of Wootton, Oxon; Rural Dean of Woodstock.

Hodgson, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Minor Canon of Winchester Cathedral and Rector of St. Swithun's, Winchester; Vicar of Whitchurch, Hants.

Icely, Rev. Frank, M.A.; Chaplain to the *Barfleur*.

Johnson, Rev. Thomas G., late Curate-in-Charge of Rainhill, St. Helens; Vicar of St. Thomas-by-Launceston, Cornwall.

Lambert, Rev. Charles Ernest; Rector of Warleggan, Cornwall.

Locke, Rev. Walter James, M.A.; Vicar of Caton-with-Littledal, Lancaster.

Lowe, Rev. T. Hill, Rector of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Glasgow; Vicar of Cononley-with-Bradley, Yorkshire.

Moore, Rev. H. H.; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Hoxton.

Norris, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of Liskeard; Surrogate for the Diocese of Truro.

Phillips, Rev. John F., M.A., Senior Curate of Keighley; Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Leeds.

Roberts, Rev. W. Page, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Peter's, Vere-street; Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.

Russell, Rev. H. G. D., M.A., Vice-Principal of St John's College, Rangoon; Chaplain of Chittagong.

Shepherd, Rev. W. R., M.A., Curate of Walford-on-the-Wye; Rector of Etchingham, Sussex.

Taylor, Rev. R. H., M.A, Vicar of Shelley; Honorary R. D. Secretary of the Church Army for the Deanery of Huddersfield.

Thompson, Rev. R. P., M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Portman-square; Secretary of the National Society for St. Marylebone Deanery.

Weatherill, Rev. D., Curate of St. German's, Roath; Secretary of the National Society for Llandaff Upper Deanery (South-east).

Wellesley Wesley, Rev. L. H., Vicar of Hatchford, Cobham, Surrey; a Select Preacher in Durham Cathedral.

Whitaker, Rev. John, Vicar of Cononley-with-Bradley; Rector of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Glasgow.

White, Rev. W. B., B.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Old-street; Secretary of the National Society for Shoreditch Deanery.

Whittingham, Rev. J. G. Napier, M.A., Rector of Duntsbourne Abbots; Vicar of Evesham All Saints'.

Wood, Rev. James Russell, LL.D.; Rector of Beyton, Suffolk.

Woodward, Rev. W. M.; East London Clergyman at St. Gabriel's, Bromley.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baker, Rev. Henry Martyn, Chaplain to the Worshipful Company of Ironmongers, at the Chaplain's House, Kingsland-road, on the 14th inst.

Banks, Rev. John Waters, formerly H.M. Chaplain in the Convict Service, Portsmouth, and afterwards Rector of Nuthall, at Cornercott, Mayow-road, Sydenham, on the 12th inst., aged 86.

Barnard, Rev. Markland, M.A., for sixty-seven years Vicar of St. Peter's, Colney, and Ridge, many years Rural Dean of Barnet, and Domestic Chaplain to the Earls of Caledon, at Galley Dean, Chelmsford, on the 15th inst.

Barton, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Rainhill, at Rainhill Vicarage, on the 11th inst., aged 67.

Cottle, Rev. Thomas, M.A. Oxon, formerly for twenty years Vicar of Shalfleet, Isle of Wight, and Rector of Petton, Shropshire, at Ningwood Manor House, Isle of Wight, on the 8th inst., aged 90.

Cruddas, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Warden, Honorary Canon of Newcastle, and Rural Dean, at Nether Warden, Hexham, on the 12th inst., aged 66.

Hodgson, Rev. Evelyn Gisborne, at New Mill Vicarage, on the 15th inst., aged 48.

Sayce, Rev. George J., formerly Vicar of Butcombe, at Rosemont, Clevedon, on the 16th inst., aged 80.

The Church of England Pulpit.

GODLINESS.

By the Rev. C. J. RIDGEWAY, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Paddington.

Sermon Preached in All Saints' Church, Margaret Street, on December 7th, 1894, as one of a series in connection with the Christian Social Union.

"Exercise thyself unto godliness: for bodily exercise is profitable for a little; but godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life which now is, and of that which is to come."—1 Tim. iv. 7-8.

GODLINESS! it is noble, it is a comprehensive word. Godliness; it not only means morality; it is not merely orthodoxy; but it is an absorbing, a pervading influence that leads men to God, that transforms the character of the man into the likeness of God, that fills the heart of man with love of God. It is the life of Christ believed in, and lived out in life and conduct. And of this godliness St. Paul says that it is profitable for the life that is to come. This is an aspect of religion that is familiar to us all; it is an aspect that has been exaggerated till people have come to look upon godliness as a means by which we may go to heaven when we die; as an escape from the fires of hell and of hell punishment. This is an aspect that was recognised even by the heathen, by the savage Indian, who had his bow and arrows and his dog buried with him; by the New Zealander, who saw in the stars of heaven the eyes of his dead chief; and by the ancient Roman, who was buried with a coin in his mouth to pay the ferry across which he must pass to the other side. Yes, this is a very common aspect of godliness or religion.

But we must remember that it is profitable also for the life that now is. This is not quite so clear. We have come to make religion a Sunday thing. Religion, godliness—it is all very well for the sick or the old or the dying, but surely it lies outside the sphere of our daily life! Is not this a very common way of regarding godliness? And thus it is that we have taken many of our Lord's teachings, and narrowed them down. For instance, His words, the kingdom of God or the kingdom of heaven, which He uses so often, have been taken again and again to mean something that was yet to come. But godliness is profitable for the life that now is. This is the point that St. Paul is specially dwelling upon; it is this that he is emphasising; for then, as now, it was a truth in danger of being forgotten. Is he right, my brethren? or are we right in our every-day idea of the true nature of godliness? Godliness is made for man, man as he is; and the great characteristic, and the excellence of the religion of Christ is this—that it fits in to the needs of men, that it exactly answers to the necessities of men. Man is an eternal being, and therefore his religion must have to do with eternity. But eternity begins here and now, it has to do with this life as well as the life to come, and therefore his religion must be profitable for the life that now is.

Yes, godliness is a Catholic religion; it is profitable for all things and all men. All have found in Christ and in His teaching that which each one of them requires, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, learned and ignorant—all have found what they wanted. Yes, because all men need light; and godliness is the light given by God to lighten men's spiritual faculties. And godliness is for all the duties of life; it has to do with great things as well as with small. It has to do with our social life, our private life, our political life. It is for the whole of man, man as God made him in his threefold capacity, body, soul, and spirit; it influences and raises and helps; it is for days bright and days sad; for the days of health and strength, for the days of weakness and sickness, for the days of sinning and the days of striving, for the days of living and the days of dying. It is profitable because it is in harmony with the lives of all men; and, more than that, it permeates our lives, and influences our lives as does the light of God everything upon which it falls. It is that which raises, dignifies, and exalts these lives of ours. How does it do so? What does godliness do for our lives in order thus to raise them? Godliness introduces into our lives higher motives. The glory of God! What a difference this makes in all we do; not only in the things that we do for God, but also in the things that we are obliged to do for our own very existence. Whatever we do we can be actuated by this great, this high motive. "Whatsoever ye do, whether ye eat or drink, do all to the glory of God."

Godliness imparts to life a higher character. A great painter was asked one day why it was that he expended so much toil and time painting one particular picture when he might be painting many pictures that might be sold with profit to himself. And his answer seemed a simple one; but was that of one who had sounded the great secret of life: "I paint for eternity," he said. Godliness breathes into life a new, a higher character. Selfishness is the natural motive, but godliness gives a supernatural motive instead. It lifts life into a higher atmosphere; it takes us out of the fogs and mists of life; it removes us from the restlessness that belongs to mere living; it lifts us into the peace of God that passeth all under-

standing. Aye, and more than that, it instils higher principles into life. It leavens the whole of life. Thus it is that Christ's religion has worked from the very first. Those who preached godliness did not bid the slaves break off their chains and free themselves. They preached great principles; they sowed the seeds of truth; and by-and-by these made their appearance; and the chains of the slaves were broken off, not by themselves, but by those who felt the power of godliness.

Godliness, then, is profitable for ourselves; and would be profitable for us even if there were no hereafter. It is also profitable for others. The godly man must care for, feel for, work for others; he must sympathise with, he must seek to lighten, by being willing to share, the burdens of other people. It is always difficult to bring this ideal teaching into our daily life, and to apply it, unless God gives us that simplicity whereby alone we are enabled to utilise the great principles of godliness. But let me illustrate what I mean by one point. One of the questions of the day, and one surrounded with difficulties is, How are we to keep Sunday? People are not satisfied with the old idea of keeping Sunday which has prevailed so long in this country. A Puritan Sunday is unsatisfactory from every point of view, whether it be of the body or the mind or the spirit of a man. And so there is a good deal of talk and discussion, and many various answers, as to how Sunday shall be kept. But might we not find a real answer to the question by asking ourselves, which is the more profitable way of keeping Sunday, not only for ourselves, but for others? For many of us who have plenty of time to amuse ourselves and take our pleasure on other days, surely there is from that point of view only one answer as to the best way of keeping Sunday, namely, not doing our own pleasure unless the worship of God be our pleasure. A Sunday spent from God by those who have during the rest of the week plenty of time for themselves, is so much time taken from God. But then, there are many others who have not the time that we have, not the opportunities, who live their lives in drudgery from the beginning of the week to the end; and therefore while settling for ourselves the question, it is much harder to settle it for those people. But what I want to impress upon you is, Does not the present way of spending Sunday that is becoming the fashion, does it not mean an absence of that godliness which is profitable for all men, not only for ourselves, but for others, so that the godly man may make his influence felt even by those who do not realise its profit for themselves? Which, for instance, is the more profitable—the worldliness that makes people do exactly what they feel inclined to do upon Sunday, or the godliness that puts a restraint upon the man's action; the worldliness which causes numbers of people—servants, hotel-keepers—to work harder upon Sunday than any other day; the worldliness that never stops to think how their example may affect other people; the worldliness that makes other people regard the religion of those who thus use Sunday as a mere sham; the worldliness that makes poor people think that there is one law for the rich, and another for the poor—which, I ask, is the more profitable, this worldliness, or the godliness which makes even the man who works hard during the week hesitate as to doing exactly what he pleases upon the Sunday because of others?

It is in this way, I think, that we may test many of our actions, and solve the various questions as to how we ought to act, what we may do, and what we ought to abstain from doing. Exercise thyself then unto godliness. Practise it. It is not an easy thing. It has difficult lessons to teach, but these must be learnt in the life that now is, if we are to enjoy the good results of them in the life that is to come. Practise it; give time to it; give thought to it; take pains about it; have rules that will help you in the discharge of this godliness. But is not this exactly what we do not do? Godliness is a work to be done by each one of us for our own profit and the profit of others, to be exercised, to be practised. Why, we have heard how those who engage in gymnastic occupations are obliged to give up years of their life merely to the practice of this particular exercise. I have heard of a great billiard player who spent many hours for many consecutive months simply practising one particular stroke by which he might make his name famous. And godliness! how much do we exercise it? how much do we practise it? Surely the counsel of the Apostle comes well into our ears, "Exercise thyself unto godliness." Cultivate it, use gladly anything that helps its development. Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and then all these things that a true Christian must desire, not only for himself, but for those who have them not—then all these things shall be added unto you.

THE GREAT TRIUMPH.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A.

Sermon Preached in St. Peter's Church, Hereford, on Sunday Morning, January 20th, 1895.

"Now thanks be unto God, who always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that believe, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savour of death unto death, and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?"—2 Cor. ii. 14-16.

THE Apostle Paul laboured under the double disadvantage of open enmity from the heathen and Jewish opposers of the Gospel and of the factious strivings within the Christian Church of those that in name at least were friends. In

this very epistle, when defending himself against the "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ" (2 Cor. xi. 13), he tells a tale of sufferings and persecutions, enough to make a stout heart tremble—"perils of waters, perils of robbers, perils by the heathen, perils in the city, perils in the wilderness, perils in the sea, perils among false brethren (2 Cor. xi. 26). Yet in spite of the dangers and adversities that beset him behind and before, he realises that in Christ the victory is his, and he can exclaim in the words of our text: "Now thanks be unto God who always causeth us to triumph in Christ." The more literal translation of the words is, "who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ"; and the reference throughout these verses is to the celebration of a Roman general's triumph at Rome. It was granted by the Senate, but only when a signal and decisive victory had been gained over the enemies of the Roman people. The Corinthians would remember how that two hundred years before this L. Mummius, after destroying Corinth and quenching the last flickering of Greek liberty in Achaia, had received this honour, and had entered Rome in triumph. In these grand celebrations the victor was supposed to represent the national god, and in solemn procession was conducted to the Capitol or temple of that god. First came the musicians playing pieces in honour of the general, and these were followed by young men leading animals intended for sacrifice. Next came the rich spoils taken from the enemy, with horses and chariots, and then, loaded with chains, the kings, princes, nobles and generals, that had been made prisoners in the war. The victor himself, in a purple robe interwoven with figures of gold, followed in a chariot adorned with ivory and gold, and drawn by a pair of white horses. He wore a crown on his head, and in his right hand he carried a laurel branch, the token of his success. The assembled people raise the cry of triumph as he passes along, and strew the ground with flowers, and the streets are filled with incense. The procession is closed by the Senate and the priests, the latter leading a white ox, the chief victim of the sacrifice. They proceed along the sacred way, past the triumphal arch to the Temple of Jupiter, and then the sacrifices are offered, the prisoners are slain or set free according as they reject or accept terms from their conquerors, and in the meantime the temples of the city are opened, and the air is laden with the smoke of offerings and incense.

Such is the picture of a Roman triumph, and the unfolding of the allegory will illustrate the teaching of the Apostle here.

The Son of God, then, is the triumphant Victor riding on because of the word of truth, of meekness and of righteousness in His chariot of salvation. "He hath spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them, openly triumphing ove them" on His cross of shame (Col. ii. 15). He has ascended on high and led captivity captive, and received gifts for men, yea, even for the rebellious also, that the Lord God may dwell among them. The cross that was to cut short His glorious enterprise has become only the stepping-stone to His royal throne. And on earth triumph is in His train. Silently, but surely, the iron empire bows down before Him. "The weapons of His warfare are not carnal, but they are mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds"—the strongholds of sin and Satan (2 Cor. x. 4). Jewish unbelief and Gentile idolatry, Roman worldliness, Corinthian profligacy tremble at His approach, and own Him their conqueror. And all this comes of God's Word as well as of Christ's work. It is the Father's good pleasure to give Him the kingdom. *He must* reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet, and God hath told Him, saying, "Sit Thou on My right hand till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." And the triumph is already on the move, though it has not yet attained its final consummation; and he that uttered this allegory, and wrote the words before us, furnishes in his own experience an example of how sinners are led captive by Christ to do His will. He was once a persecutor of Christ, and once he made havoc of His Church. He once, in the ignorance of a self-righteous heart, made war upon his God. But the road to Damascus was the sacred way where he became a captive in the Redeemer's triumphal train, a trophy of the conquest of Divine love. "What wilt Thou have Me to do?" is the word of his submission, the token of his acceptance of the terms of saving grace; and in a far different spirit from that of the apostate emperor who afterwards used the words might the Apostle of the Gentiles have exclaimed, "O Galilean, thou hast conquered."

Learn then first a lesson of submission to Jesus. They that are saved by Him submit to Him. They that would share His righteousness must cease from trying to establish their own. Every unpardoned sinner is like a subject in arms against his rightful King. Therefore the only way to serve Him is first to submit to Him, in accepting His mercy, and believing the truth of His salvation. St. Paul was trying to serve God when in his fiery persecuting zeal he was blindly running upon the bosses of his Almighty's buckler, and he had to be taught the more excellent way to the privilege of service by obtaining mercy and accepting that "righteousness which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

As our allegory proceeds the Apostle changes his place in it. "God," he says, "maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ." The Apostle represents himself no longer as Christ's captive, who has been overcome by the mighty

Conqueror and has submitted to the terms of His reconciliation. Now we see him among the celebrants of his triumph, an incense-bearer diffusing around the sweet odour of the Saviour's name. St. Paul here makes use of the same word as St. John, when speaking of Mary's anointing of our Lord, he says, "The house was filled with the odour of the ointment (John xii. 3). The house of the Church, the cities of the world, are filled with the savour of that name which is above every name. It is—

"The name of Jesus,
Emmanuel, Christ the Lord,
Like fragrance on the breezes
His name abroad is poured."

And they that make that name known, whether apostles or prophets, evangelists, pastors, or teachers, parent, brother, sister, friend, yea, every faithful worker of Christ, are incense-bearers in the great triumph of the Son of God, of which eternity shall know no end. And for our encouragement let us notice, as we are here taught, that we have (1) God's commission, and (2) God's commendation for this service of loyal love. We have God's commission, for it is His own work, for who else we may ask with the Apostle "is sufficient for these things?" "Our sufficiency," he says "is of God." The Apostle does not magnify human talent to the exclusion of God's mighty operation. He does not minimise the difficulties presented by the character of those to whom the Gospel is sent. But he refers the prompting power, the sustaining grace, the preparing and overruling Providence to Him who only uses His servants as the instruments of His work in making manifest the savour of Christ's knowledge; and thus he is humble in success and confident in the time of failure. And again we have God's commendation, for we are one with Christ as Christ is with us, accepted in the Beloved, and so children in whom, as in His Only-begotten, the Father is well pleased. And as our salvation in Christ is acceptable to God, so is our service in Christ, as the Apostle writes here, "we are a sweet savour of Christ unto God." The very word is the same as that which St. Paul uses of Christ's Atonement, when, as we read, "He gave Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2.) Here is the true Scriptural description of Christian service, not the laborious toil of those who thereby would secure acceptance with God and establish their own goodness before God. Christian service is Christ's service—the service that flows from union and communion with Him, the grateful exertion of those that in Him have found acceptance with the Father, the labour that results from spiritual life, even that life that is hid with Christ in God. The fabled god, in whose honour the sacrifices were offered on the day of a victor's triumph at Rome, could take no pleasure in the devotion of his worshippers. But we know that our service is a sweet savour of Christ to God, and this knowledge is a comfort indeed. The work is not perfect, it is not faultless, it is often feeble and failing; but in its measure it is a sacrifice in which God delighteth, for it is the renewing of Christ's own loving life, and is the fruit of God's grace, seeing that He worketh in us both to will and to work for His good pleasure" (Phil. ii. 13, R.V.).

But to proceed with our allegory. "We are," says the Apostle, "a sweet savour of Christ unto God in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savour of (from) death unto death, and to the other the savour of (from) life unto life." Such is the teaching of the Rabbis with respect to the words of the law: "They are the savour of lives to the Israelites, and a savour of death to the people of this world." *

Here the reference is to the treatment of the prisoners after the pageant, and the way in which the odour of the incense wafted to and fro appealed to their senses. To those prisoners that had obstinately refused all terms of alliance and peace in hatred of their conquerors, it would be as the stench of a noisome dungeon, the breath of pestilence, the fetid odour of corruption. These from their present state, in their body of death, are hurried away to their final doom, and thus the incense of the triumph is to them "the savour of death unto death." But there are others among the crowd of captives who are willing to accept the terms of Rome, and to live henceforth as tributaries to the empire of the world. Their life had been threatened by war and conquest, but they are going back to life again, like Isaac of old, from under the blade of death. They scent the incense, and it seems to them like the odour of ointment poured forth, like the choice perfumes of Arabia, and it is to them "the savour of life unto life." And such says the Apostle is a representation of the Gospel amongst men. (1) To them that are perishing without Christ, perishing in their sins, perishing with the world the knowledge of the Saviour, and those that proclaim it are "a savour of death unto death." The one subject of knowledge most scorned and shunned by men, yea, often by those that profess the Christian name, is the knowledge of Christ. The knowledge of political, social, yea, of religious affairs, they seek. The knowledge of men and things, of trade and business, of science and art, is their study, but to know Christ is not their concern. Yet St. Paul said, "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord." But why is this knowledge of Christ avoided? Why will not men know their Saviour? The answer is plain. It is because they will not know themselves as sinners. They need Him so much, and yet they will not know Him. And thus they are perishing, as says the Psalmist: "They that are far from

* Dr. A. Clarke.

Thee shall perish." In their hunger they are trying to satisfy themselves with that which is not bread; in their thirst they hew out for themselves cisterns—broken cisterns that can hold no water; or they imagine they are rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing, and know not they are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked. Dead by the just condemnation of the law of God, dead by their works in trespasses and sins they are reserving for themselves the misery of the second death. As long as they are in their present mind the Gospel of grace and the knowledge of Christ cannot but be to them a note of doom, and its sweet fragrance the savour of death unto death. "The preaching of the cross to them that are perishing," as St. Paul says in another place, "is foolishness" (1 Cor. i. 16, R.V.)—a weak and childish riddle, a strange, fantastic scheme, which their ignorance and prejudice will not let them understand. Manifested outwardly to them the Gospel is veiled in their hearts and hidden from their eyes. And the Apostle gives the awful and mysterious explanation in this Epistle, for he tells us that "the God of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them" (2 Cor. iv. 3, 4). (2) But to them that are saved—"to them that are being saved"—to them that are willing captives to the grace of Christ in His triumphant salvation, the good tidings of God's mercy are "the savour of life unto life." The word of His salvation tells them of life in the God-man, Christ Jesus, who raised man above his first estate by His righteous obedience in the flesh, slew death by His death, and by His rising again restored to us everlasting life. And this savour of life is a sweet harbinger of their own life renewed in Him—the life of holiness, the life of truth, the life of spiritual joy, the life of Divine communion, the life of preparation for heaven, according to the Saviour's own saying, "Because I live ye shall live also." The savour of the knowledge of Christ! How sweet above all other sweetness is the knowledge of Him in Whose knowledge "standeth our eternal life"! Rejoice, believer, in the captivity into which Christ thy Redeemer has brought thee. Rejoice that He draws thee with the cords of His love, though they may have seemed to thee the cords of affliction, and judgment, and wrath. He triumphs over thee that thou mayest partake of the honour of His name. He has brought thee to the submission of repentance toward God, and faith toward Himself, that He may set thee about His service to diffuse around thee in thy new life the blessed fragrance of His saving name. For,

> How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
> In a believer's ear,
> It soothes his sorrows, heals his wounds,
> And drives away his fear.

One more lesson let us learn from the passage before us. The acceptance with God of our service of winning souls does not depend upon its success amongst men. The faithfulness of service lies upon us, but the fruit of it is in higher hands. Not only in them that are saved, but in them that perish, says St. Paul, we are a sweet savour of Christ to God. "My word," saith Jehovah in this morning's first lesson, "shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isaiah lv. 11). Whether men accept or reject the message of God's truth and love, the word of eternal life, He shall not be defeated of His glory. We shall not miss the approving smile of His face, the gracious favour of His love, the richness and fulness of His reward. We shall not have laboured in vain, nor spent our strength for nought, for, "though Israel be not gathered," may each faithful servant of Jesus say, "yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength" (Isaiah xlix. 5).

GOD'S VARIETY.

By the Rev. W. H. PARSONS, Curate of the Parish Church, Birmingham.

"Jesus loved Martha and her sister, and Lazarus."—John xi. 5.

EVERYTHING that God has made is noted for its variety. Nowhere in creation can you find a dull monotony. Trees and flowers, birds and animals, and even human faces, differ widely one from another. And it would be a dull and uninteresting and monotonous world if it were not so. Its variety is its charm. And what is true of the world of Nature is also true of the spiritual world. If men differ from each other in face, they also differ in temperament and character. Each one of us has been born with a distinct personality of our own, an individuality which we can never obliterate, which we can never materially alter. God does not mould all His saints after the same pattern, but each one differs from the other, and in each there shines out conspicuously certain graces which his character is specially suited to produce. We have a very good illustration of this truth in that little home at Bethany. Of the character of Lazarus, Holy Scripture tells us nothing, but we do get an insight into the characters of both Martha and Mary; and two more unlike it would be almost impossible to find. Martha was active, stirring, and impulsive; Mary was quiet, still, and contemplative. Lazarus was probably something different from either; and yet they were all the true disciples of Jesus, and Jesus acknowledged them all as His own. "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus."

There is a useful lesson for us here, for there

are similar characters in the Church to-day. We learn that we must not expect all Christians to be exactly alike, nor set down others as having no grace because their experience does not exactly correspond with our own. In the Church, as in the world, there is variety. There are quiet and retiring spirits who love to spend much time in private communion with God. They never seem to be anxious or worried, nothing seems to ruffle them, they could not become excited or fussy, and they live a quiet, undisturbed, peaceful life, a life of holy, heavenly contemplation. They do not, perhaps, undertake much active work for Christ, but the secret, silent influence of their lives tells upon others, and in this quiet way they do a work which the more active spirits could not accomplish.

But there are others who are more like Martha, always full of activity and work, never happy unless they are doing something; full of enthusiasm, full of earnestness, full of zeal. These do a work for God which the others could not do. We cannot make all people alike, for God has made us to differ. Each one possesses certain abilities, certain talents, certain peculiarities of constitution, even a certain manner, which no one else possesses, and therefore God can use each one to do some work which can be done by no other individual.

But whilst it is true that we cannot entirely alter, it is also true that we can, to a certain extent, modify and correct. And this we are bound to do. If we really know our own character, we have need to watch lest the particular bias of our mind lead us into dangerous extremes. For instance, what may be praiseworthy activity may degenerate into mere fussiness. If Martha knows that she is in danger of being careful and troubled about many things, she has need to set apart more time for sitting at the Master's feet. And, on the other hand, one who is much given to a life of meditation, if he is not careful, is in danger of becoming an unpractical mystic.

No Christian has a right to complain on account of what he is. Rather should he say, "By the grace of God I am what I am." Whatever talents and abilities I may possess, they are His gifts; and whatever may be my character, temperament, and disposition, they are a part of myself, and must be dedicated to His service.

Consider the Apostles of our Lord, and see how they differed one from the other. There could not possibly be a greater contrast between two men than that between Peter and Thomas—the one with the warm, impulsive, affectionate nature; the other cold, cautious, and reserved. The two men were as wide asunder as the poles, and yet they were both chosen and called by Christ to be His disciples. In choosing Apostles He is the God of variety.

Or, to take another illustration, look at the Epistles of the New Testament. They were written by five men, and though all inspired by the same Holy Ghost, yet by their style and contents they show that they are from the pen of different writers. Even after a man becomes an Apostle, he still retains his individuality. Most of the Apostles were unlettered fishermen, and there was not, probably, one of them who was sufficiently educated and intellectual to write an Epistle like that of St. Paul to the Romans. But God intended such an Epistle to be written. Could He not make use of Peter or John to write it? Undoubtedly He could. But God recognises the fact that men are differently constituted, and accordingly He makes use of special men to do particular work for which they are particularly fitted. And so the educated and intellectual Pharisee Saul of Tarsus, was converted, and was chosen by God to write that profound Epistle, a work for which he was by nature specially qualified. As he himself has said, "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all."

The Church of Christ as a whole is one body, but it is composed of many members; and just as in our own body the eye and the ear, the hand and the foot, has each its special office, so it is with the members of Christ's mystical Body. Each one is appointed to do some special work, for which he is specially fitted.

It is an interesting and beautiful sight to walk through some very large manufactory where, perhaps, thousands of hands are engaged. Under one roof there are various departments, and to a stranger it seems at first rather confusing. But yet there is perfect order. Each person employed on the works occupies his appointed place. He knows exactly what he has to do, and he performs his allotted task. He does not, perhaps, understand the work in the next department. He has learned one branch of the trade, and to that he gives his attention. And the result is that though there are thousands at work at the same time, there is an utter absence of confusion, and throughout the establishment there is perfect order and harmony.

This is just a picture of what the Christian Church ought to be. Some are specially fitted for one branch of service, and some for another. Men like Bishop Lightfoot and Bishop Westcott have, as scholars, a special work to do for God. Their learning and scholarship, consecrated to His service, enable them to elucidate difficulties in connection with the Scriptures. God has given them both the natural intellect and the advantages of education to fit them for that special work. Then there are men who have gifts in another direction, and are able to draw thousands of people together to listen to the Gospel. These men, perhaps, could not write learned books, but neither could the great

scholars become, in the ordinary sense of the term, popular preachers. And yet both classes are serving God in their own special department. Diversities of gifts, but the same spirit.

There are others, again, like Charles Wesley and Toplady, and John Newton and Frances Ridley Havergal, who were able to write beautiful hymns—hymns which are known and loved wherever the English language is spoken, and which will last to the end of time. This was the special gift which God entrusted to them, and which they used to His glory. There are many others who are neither scholars, preachers, nor hymn-writers, who are yet truly serving God in some other department of service. In their quiet way they are doing good, and though, perhaps, unknown by men, they are honoured by the Master's smile. Let us thank God for this wonderful variety. The Marthas and the Marys, the Thomases and the Peters, the Johns and the Pauls are all needed in the Church, and there is more work being accomplished for Christ by this variety of workers than would be the case if we were all exactly alike, possessing the same characters, the same intellects, the same gifts. Let us never envy another who, we imagine, has superior gifts to our own. To do so is to find fault with God, for He made us what we are. Let us never seek to be feeble imitators of another, for we shall best serve God by being natural, and using, to the best of our ability, the talents He has given us. Let us never look down upon, or despise, others who we may imagine are less gifted than ourselves. We have nothing to boast of, for we have nothing which we did not receive; and the very humblest Christian, whom we may be tempted to despise, can render some service to God which we cannot render. Let us, then, be content with our position, our talents, and all that He has given us.

> Content to fill a little space,
> If He be glorified.

And when our imperfect service on earth is ended, and we are called to the higher eternal service beyond, is it not possible that one of the glories of heaven will be its variety? As we stand in that great company around the Throne there may be one act of service which each can render, one note of thanksgiving which each can supply, which will help to make the whole harmony complete.

THE Bishop of Coventry (Dr. Knox) was married to Miss Ethel Newton, daughter of Canon Newton, vicar of Redditch, in the parish church, Redditch, on Thursday afternoon, the 21st ult. The Bishop of Worcester performed the ceremony, assisted by Archdeacon Walters and the Rev. F. Gell. The bride was attended by six bridesmaids, her sisters Madeleine, Elsie, Daisy, Dorothea, and Majorie, her cousin Miss Molly Moore, and Master Horace Newton as page. The Rev. Lindsey Knox acted as best man.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1895.

RE-UNION.

WHEN some one suggested to a famous American that the lion and the lamb would one day lie down together, the American expressed a fear that the lamb would repose inside the lion. This must be our reply to the visionaries of "Re-union." The respected leader of the E.C.U., Lord Halifax, has just delivered an important statement on his cherished subject. From the terms he uses, one might suppose that a very few Papal concessions would bring about the consummation. Of course the validity of our orders is one. But, apparently, Lord Halifax is willing to admit many Roman claims, even the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, nor does he even so much as mention as obstacles such cardinal points of difference between the Roman and Anglican bodies as communion in one or both kinds. He even goes so far as to throw doubts upon the veracity and accuracy of our Church historians who dispute the Roman origin of the English Church. We are to infer, then, that the party for re-union on the Anglican side, so far as it is identified with Lord Halifax, are not determined to insist on—

I.—The absolute freedom of the Christian Church in this empire from the control of a foreign prelate, our Articles notwithstanding.

II.—Such an important doctrinal point, to mention no others, as communion to the lay people in both kinds, with all the Eucharistic teaching it involves.

III.—The historical position of the Ancient Church in these islands, which has never willingly yielded to the shadowy claim of the Pope to sit in St. Peter's chair, and hold the keys and authority divinely committed to the Apostles as a body, but

which our opponents make out to be a sort of heir-loom in the Vatican.

On such premisses, re-union could only be of the kind described by the American—the Anglican lamb entirely swallowed up by the Roman lion. For they involve the very essentials of our true position as a Church, and to yield them would be to write ourselves down heretics and schismatics without excuse.

If Lord Halifax and his sympathisers want to be merged into the Church of Rome, their way is clear. But we do not think many people will think with them. Consider the practical results. For instance, in the case of the Roman hierarchy unwisely suffered to be re-established in our land. The Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Italian Mission have assumed a position quite unwarranted. They have taken advantage of singular acts of courtesy in high quarters to push themselves into social precedence not accorded to them by usage. They have assumed the titles of Anglican sees, and used them ostentatiously without any mark of distinction. In fact, they lose no opportunity of pronouncing our own prelates the intruders. The action of the Archbishop of Dublin, ill-advised as we think it, is nothing in the face of the monstrous impertinence of these Roman usurpations. Now, how will re-union settle this? Which are to be the true Bishops? If both, what about the duplicates?

The Papal Primacy, which Lord Halifax seems to distinguish from Papal supremacy, cuts away the historical position of the English Church, inasmuch as it is bound to involve, somehow, admission of the Petrine claims. Against them we have taken our firmest stand, believing that there is no historical proof that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, or that he communicated to the incumbent of that see special apostolical powers and privileges. We have maintained that the evidence is totally insufficient to justify a reunion of these Churches. The end of such a course is bound to be the absorption of the Church of England in the Church of Rome, as the price of Roman recognition, which, we suspect, is the moot point with Lord Halifax and his party. It is the only re-union which Rome could tolerate, for re-union on equal terms would mean the break-up of the modern Roman system. The concessions which alone would justify the Anglican position would place modern Christendom in the condition of the Early Church, a free federation, united on the ground of *quod ab omnibus*, *quod semper*, *quod ubique*, which is quite incompatible with Papal supremacy, or Primacy, or any kind of Roman hegemony whatever. It is safe to predict that no Pope will ever put up with that.

On the other hand, it is most unsafe for any Anglican to suffer himself to contemplate anything short of that. There is no reason why we should trouble ourselves about re-union with the Churches of the West more than about re-union with the Churches of the East, except proximity, and the comfort of the mutual recognition of orders. But Roman recognition of Anglican orders is too trifling a thing to value very highly. It has always been a matter of policy rather than principle at Rome. One Pope offered to accept our Prayer-Book in the reign of Elizabeth, another twice offered a Cardinal's hat to Laud in the reign of Charles the First. In the interval of fifty odd years no doubt seems to have arisen in the infallible minds of St. Peter's successors as to the Apostolicity of the English Episcopate. Anglican orders were valid then, because that was the convenient course; they are not now, because times have changed a little; they will be again, when times have changed a little more. Such recognition is not worth a rush.

The difference between the Anglican and the Roman Churches is one of fundamentals. It can never be arranged by compromise. The proper position for re-unionists should not be apologetic and exculpatory, which Lord Halifax's seems to be, but like that of the greatest Archbishop of Canterbury since St. Thomas, Archbishop Laud, whom Rome would have not only recognised, but promoted to the highest honours, but he would not suffer it, because there was that within him which forbade it until Rome was other than she was. And of that there is, as yet, no sign.

THE annual meetings of the S.P.G., held in Bath on Monday week, were largely attended. The Bishop of Bath and Wells, who preached on behalf of the society at two of the Bath churches on Sexagesima Sunday, presided over both meetings, and earnestly advocated the society's claims. The S.P.G. set itself first of all to do work in the Colonies belonging to England. It had pleased God in His providence that some part of his own life should be spent in colonial Church work, and he could say that had it not been for the help of the S.P.G. many of those lands would not have been able to preserve their Christianity. In saying what he did of S.P.G., he in no way wished to overlook the valuable work of another kind done by the sister society, the C.M.S., which had his sincere sympathy; and he commended the secretary's report as setting forth the relationship which ought to exist between the two societies. Archdeacon Shaw, of Tokio, also addressed the afternoon meeting. The Rev. M. N. Trollope, who was to have given a lantern lecture on Corea at the Guildhall in the evening, was prevented from doing so owing to a severe chill. His place was at the last moment taken by the Rev. W. L. Groves, a former C.M.S. missionary from China, who came to the aid of the sister society and gave a most interesting lantern lecture on life in China. The report, which is signed by the hon. secs., the Rev. B. Norton Thompson and Mr. H. R. Grimes, stated that the committee were able to report progress all along the line. In nearly every parish there had been an increase in the amounts returned.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE Upper House of the Northern Convocation has unanimously approved the report of the Archbishop's Committee on voluntary schools. The Bishop of Manchester, who moved the resolution, expressed his approval of the proposal that the State should undertake the payment of teachers. But he added that he would allow no State interference with their appointment. We are afraid that it will be a long time before State aid can be looked for upon that condition

We are indebted to the courtesy of Prebendary Reynolds for an early copy of his report for last year on the Church schools in the diocese of London. It is, as always, a most interesting document, and the facts which it embodies are full of encouragement to the friends of religious education. There were 144,997 children on the books of the inspected schools, 115,121 in average attendance, 121,972 present at inspection. Compared with last year, this gives a decrease of 861 on the books, and increases of 1,693 and 2,059 in average attendance and present at inspection respectively. The small decrease on the books is due to the fact that an unusually large number of schools were not inspected, chiefly owing to illness of teachers and children, otherwise there would have been a very large increase in all respects ; for the number on the books of the schools under inspection but not inspected in 1893 was 1,729, whereas in 1894 it was 5,534. So that, if the number not inspected had been normal last year, instead of a decrease of 861 there would have been an increase of about 3,000.

With regard to the schools themselves, the work has been better done than ever before. Of the 746 departments examined, 221 were classed excellent, 298 very good, 177 good, 47 fair, and only 3 bad. Comparing these with 752 departments inspected in 1893, there is an increase of 3 and 18 on the excellent and very good, the good are exactly the same, and there are decreases of 23 and 4 on the fair and bad respectively. The withdrawals from religious teaching again show considerable increase ; during the time of the School Board election the increase was very marked. The number is 1,393, against 1,214 in 1893. More than half of the total withdrawals are Jews ; in fact, there were more Jews withdrawn last year than those withdrawn from all causes ten years ago. No Church school has been transferred to the School Board during the year.

Prebendary Reynolds makes some interesting and suggestive remarks on religious teaching. He urges, for example, that in teaching the early Old Testament history, the greatest care should be taken not to give instruction which afterwards has to be explained away. To teach that the Creation took place in six days of twenty-four hours is to teach what the Bible does not teach. To teach that Adam or Cain or Abraham actually saw the First Person of the Holy Trinity is to contradict the teaching of the New Testament that "no man hath seen God at any time." It would be well to restrict the teaching of the Old Testament to the smallest limits in infants' schools. Personal piety, says Mr. Reynolds, is what is most needed in teaching religion. "Even repetition of Scripture taught by a bad man is actually harmful. This remark may seem to some unintelligble, but there is nothing I am more sure of, and it is the result of a long experience."

Lord Halifax has been making a speech at Bristol on the re-union of Christendom, which is quite in keeping with the spirit of his recent letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo. The President of the E.C.U. regards such re union as "the only legitimate conclusion of the Oxford movement," and is quite willing to re-unite under the Primacy of Rome, if only the Pope would be reasonable. The speech has attracted much attention, and the *Guardian* this week attempts to minimise its importance. It points out that Lord Halifax only desires to substitute "an honest desire for peace" for the present spirit, which leads Christians "to hug their differences, instead of mourning over them." No doubt the Pope, in his present mood, out of which Cardinal Vaughan is unable to argue him, will see in Lord Halifax's pronouncement if it reaches him, fresh ground for believing that re-union (upon his own terms) is not so impossible as he is told it is.

It seems that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford has been selected by the Pope to answer Bishop Moorhouse's lectures on the Papal Claims. He has had some personal interviews with his Holiness at Rome, and will speak, it may be presumed, as he has been prompted. His reply to his formidable antagonist will be looked for with some interest

The scheme for the Lenten mid-day services at St. Paul's has been published. The arrangements are as follows :—March 4-8, the Rev. J. G. Simpson, vicar of St. Paul's, Dundee ; March 11-15, the Rev. A. W. Gough, vicar of St. John's, Highbury Vale; March 18-22, the Rev. Canon Heywood, vicar of Swinton ; March 25-29, the Rev. H. Armstrong Hall, rector of St. John's, Perth ; April 1-5, the Rev. Canon Knox-Little, vicar of Hoar Cross ; April 8-11, and on Good Friday at noon, the Rev. H. G. Daniell-Bainbridge, Minor Canon of Westminster.

Among other services announced we learn that Prebendary Whittington, the rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, has arranged for a series of special sermons to be preached in his church on the Friday evenings in Lent. Canon Duckworth preached the first sermon of the series on Friday, March 1st, and the subsequent preachers in order will be Canon Scott-Holland, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Colchester, Canon Fleming, and Archdeacon Farrar. Father Black will give addresses on Friday mornings at St. Mark's, North Audley Street, at a quarter to twelve.

Mr. Page Roberts's appointment to a canonry at Canterbury seems to be generally approved. The *Record* remarks, however, that while, as things go, nothing can be more natural than Mr. Roberts's preferment—he belongs to the party whom Lord Rosebery delights to honour—his friends will hardly pretend that his services to the Church, as distinct from his congregation, made the canonry a fair tribute to his success. Somebody has discovered that among the congregation at St. Peter's, Vere Street, there are more than sixty families of eminent consulting physicians and surgeons.

The Church in South London has lost an able and excellent servant in the Rev. Richard Allen, vicar of Christ Church, Gypsy Hill, whose funeral took place on the 23rd ult. Mr. Allen, who was over 70 years of

age, had held his post for 32 years, and was greatly esteemed by his people. He was a hardworking Evangelical, and a warm supporter of the Church Missionary Society and the Church Pastoral Aid Society. The vacated benefice, which is in the gift of trustees, is of the gross value of £800, with a house.

We are glad to learn that the financial year of the S.P.G. ended with an increase of income to the extent of £9,248. This was largely due to legacies, but the parochial organisations had sent up about £1,200 more than in the preceding year. The good old society is waking up, and will soon, it is to be hoped, do even better than this.

The London Diocesan Conference will be held this year on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 23rd and 24th of April. It is announced that subjects proposed for discussion must be sent to Archdeacon Thornton not later than April 2nd.

A day of intercession for Home Missions has been fixed for the 6th inst. There will be a special celebration of Holy Communion at St. Martin's-in-the Fields, when the rector, Mr. Kitto, will give an address.

The appointment of the Rev. Canon Moore Ede, rector of Gateshead, to the Hulsean Lectureship, came (according to the local correspondent of the *Record*) as a great surprise to the diocese of Durham, but why the writer does not explain. He goes on to say that Canon Moore Ede is a Broad Churchman, with wide sympathies, and is greatly interested in social questions, especially old-age pensions. He is an advanced Liberal in politics, and a great personal friend of Professor Stuart, M.P. for Hackney.

St. David's Day, Friday, the 1st of March, aptly chosen for the great demonstration against Welsh Disestablishment, and in favour of Church Defence generally, was held at Queen's Hall. Langham Place. Among the speakers were two Archbishops, the Bishop of Oxford, Lord Wolmer, and Lady Frederick Cavendish.

At King's College, London, on Tuesday, at 7 p.m. the Rev. Professor Caldecott will give a free lecture on "Memory."

It is announced that the consecration of Dr. Percival as Bishop of Hereford will take place in Westminster Abbey on St. Mark's Day (April 25th).

The living of Bovey Tracey, vacant by the death of Canon the Hon. C. L. Courtenay, has been offered by the Earl of Rosebery to Dr. Knight-Bruce, late Bishop of Mashonaland, and has been accepted by him. He has also been appointed Assistant-Bishop in the diocese of Exeter.

On Monday it was reported that the Bishop of Rochester was still making satisfactory progress towards convalescence. At most of the churches in the diocese on Sunday prayers were offered for his recovery. During the day the Archbishop of Canterbury called at the Bishop's house in Kennington Park Road. It is stated that some weeks must elapse before the Bishop is able to attend to ordinary business, and it is not anticipated that he can resume any active work before May or June.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

"CHRIST'S HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH," ACCORDING TO CHURCH PRINCIPLES.

Sir,—The only expression of Mr. Docker's letter in your issue of Feb. 2nd, to which I specially alluded in mine of Feb. 16th, is his saying, "The Church I take to be the plan which God ordained after the fall of our first parents in the Garden of Eden." I asked, "How can 'the Church' be 'the plan' which Mr. Docker speaks of?" When I read his letter in to-day's paper (Feb. 23rd) I supposed that the word "plan" had been a misprint in his former letter for "place." For he writes in his last, "I will answer the reverend gentleman's question, 'How can "the Church" be "the place" which Mr. Docker takes it to be?' by stating, because it is the place of safety appointed by the Lord to preserve our race from evil." But, on referring again to his former letter, I see that there was no misprint in it, for the sentence proceeds thus: "And the members of the Church are those who are sincerely desirous to conform to the teaching of *that plan*." "Place" instead of "plan" would be evidently out of place here, and so must be out of place in the beginning of his sentence. I still ask, "How can 'the Church' be 'the plan' Mr. Docker speaks of?" It is obviously no answer to this to change the word "plan" in my question to "place," and to say, "Because it is the place of safety," etc. I submit that "the Church," as the word occurs in the Bible, is neither a "plan" nor a "place," but a congregation of human beings. The question remains, which I answered in my last, What congregation? and of what human beings?

In his last letter Mr. Docker makes certain statements of which I can only say that, so far as I understand them, they seem to me to have nothing whatever to do with what I said (except in the "place *versus* plan" passage), and to make no attempt at defining "the one true Church." I quite agree with him that "the one true Church is wherever the Gospel is faithfully preached," if only he would add—as I suppose he does in his own mind—"and believed." It is quite true that St. Paul, in his "Bidding Prayer" (1 Tim. ii. 14), went further than the Bidding Prayer of our Church, in that it bade prayers be made for all men; but is that any proof that St. Paul considered all men to be members of "Christ's Holy Catholic Church"? Our Church very distinctly prays for all men, but not as members of the Church of Christ.

Of the rest of Mr. Docker's letter, I confess I can make neither head nor tail—I do not know what he is driving at.

W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas Vicarage,
February 23rd, 1895.

WALES AND THE CHURCH.

Sir,—I read the speech of the Home Secretary on the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, as reported in the *Standard* of the 26th of February, and quite fail to

perceive that the arguments contained therein are grounded on any leading principle that would justify the measure passing into law. The speech of the right hon. gentleman seems to me to be taken up with the money question—how the funds in certain directions which are now being used in our National Church are to be expended in case the Bill passes through Parliament. But this is very far indeed from showing that the principle of the Church of England —namely, the ruling of the nation according to the teaching of God's Word—is not able, if sufficiently obeyed, to bring everything to a people which they can desire to insure their truly prosperous condition. On this, the essential point of the question, I feel we may truly say the Bill is entirely deficient. As to the position of the Church with regard to funds, this cannot but work well, provided the laws of the one true Church are carefully obeyed, for the promise is, "No good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly" (Psa. lxxxiv. 11).

If the law of the Church is given to preserve our race from evil, it is not reasonable to suppose that anything will be wanting to prevent it working for our good. St. Paul makes this point of doctrine very clear at Rom. viii. 32, "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?"

The unfaithful mind fails to understand that the Church must work what is for good to those who obey its laws. Let us observe the words of the man of God to King Amaziah when his thoughts were influenced unduly by this world's material wealtd, "The Lord is able to give thee much more than this" (2 Chron. xxv. 9).

J. T. DOCKER.

Worthing, February, 1895.

MR. NATHANIEL SHAWCROSS ROBINSON has been licensed as a lay-reader at Otford, in the diocese of Canterbury.

THE health of the Rev. E. E. T. Candler, vicar of St. Peter's, Stockport, having suffered from continuous overwork, he left England last week in the *Gothic*, in order to obtain the benefit of a voyage to New Zealand and back. He will act as S.P.C.K. chaplain to the third-class passengers while on shipboard.

PREBENDARY WEBB-PEPLOE, vicar of St. Paul's Onslow Square, made a long explanation to his congregation on Sunday night of the circumstances attending the offer of the vicarage of Sheffield to him, and of the reasons which, after long deliberation, had induced him to decline. He spoke of Sheffield being an ideal sphere of labour, the only possible drawback being the division of influence between the new vicar and the Archdeacon, and mentioned that it was the fifth living offered him during the last twelve months, the others being Holy Trinity, Cambridge; the parish church of Hull; Christ Church, Clifton; and Holy Trinity, Tunbridge Wells.

ON Saturday, 23rd ult., the Bishop of London held a further service in Fulham Palace Chapel for the admission of diocesan readers. The gentlemen commissioned were Mr. Charles Edward Cæsar and Mr. John Ogle, M.A., and they were afterwards licensed, the former to St. Paul's, Canonbury, and the latter to St. Stephen-the-Martyr, Avenue Road, Portland Town.

IT appears from a paragraph in the *Standard* and from a letter containing corrections from Archdeacon Cheetham, that owing to the serious and continuous falling off in the revenues attached to Rochester Cathedral, consequent on the protracted depression in agriculture and the enormous depreciation in the value of land, the Dean and Chapter of Rochester have decided not to fill the vacant minor canonry. The duties of three Minor Canons and schoolmaster to the choir boys will henceforward be discharged by the two present Minor Canons, who will share the salaries thus saved. The incomes of the Dean and Canons have for some years past been diminishing but the stipends of the Minor Canons have suffered no diminution. The whole loss occasioned by the shrinkage of rent and tithe has fallen upon the Dean and Chapter. No change whatever is contemplated in the Cathedral Grammar-school, nor are the payments made from cathedral funds to this school in any way diminished.

BY an Order in Council, dated February 2nd, a parish was assigned to the church of St. Columba, Wanstead-slip. The parish is formed out of the districts of Holy Trinity, Harrow Green, and St. James's, Forest Gate, and is partly in the ancient parish of Wanstead and partly in West Ham. There is a debt of £540 on the church building fund, towards which £200 has been promised if the remainder can be raised in twelve months. The vicar-elect is the Rev. Peter Barnes, 27, Borthwick Road, E.

AT Truro Cathedral, Canon Worlledge will preach at 11 a.m. on Sundays in Lent on "The Temptation of our Lord," and a course of sermons on "Sundry Passages of Scripture moving us to Repentance" will be delivered at 6.15 p.m. by the Sub-Dean, Canon Bourke. On Tuesdays, at 4.30 p.m., after evensong, a series of short instructions on "The Athanasian Creed" will be given by the Chancellor. On Wednesdays, at 7.30 p.m., a course of sermons on "Prayer" will be preached in the parish church at evensong by the Rev. H. R. Jennings, Vice-Principal of the Divinity School. On Wednesdays, March 6th, 13th, and 20th, at 3 p.m., three lectures, on (1) The Liturgies of the East, (2) The Liturgies of the West, (3) The English Liturgy, will be given in the Chapter-room by the Precentor. On Fridays there will be the usual special Lenten service at 7.30 p.m., with sermon. The Precentor will preach on March 1st, 8th, and 15th, on "Conscience," commencing the course at 4 p.m. on Ash Wednesday. On March 22nd, 29th, and April 5th sermons on "Some Personal Experiences of God"—(1) Jacob, (2) David, (3) St. Paul—will be preached by the Rev. Edward Townend, vicar of St. John's, Penzance. The children of St. Mary's schools will be catechised either in the parish church or in the cathedral, as usual, every Sunday afternoon at 3 45 On Wednesday next, the day appointed by the Bishop to be observed in the diocese of Truro for special prayer on behalf of "Home Missions," an address after the Litany at noon will be given by the Bishop, and special intercessions will be offered. The preacher appointed for the Holy Week course is the Rev. F. W. Puller, of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley. The addresses on "The Seven Words" on Good Friday will be given by Father Puller. The Bishop of the diocese will preach at matins on Easter Day at 10.30, and Father Puller at 6.15.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alderson, Rev. H. E., M.A., Vicar of Peel, Little Hulton, Bolton; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Deanery of Bolton South.

Alford, Rev. J. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Nicholas-with-St. Leonard's, Bristol; Vicar of Stoke Bishop, Bristol.

Andrews, Rev. W. N., M.A., Vicar of North Walsham; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Deanery of Waxham.

Armstrong, Rev. Archibald Barclay, M.A., Curate of Middlesbrough; Rector of St. Margaret's, Walmgate, York.

Armstrong, Rev. H. W., B.A., Chaplain of St. Anne's, Virginia Water; Vicar of Lacock, Wilts.

Baddeley, Rev. J. J., Rector of Toppesfield, Halstead; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Deanery of Yeldham.

Badger, Rev. W. H., Rector of Great Tenbury; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Deanery of Burford West.

Baily, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Ryton-on-Tyne; Rural Dean of Chester-le-Street.

Barnes, Rev. Peter; Vicar of the New Church of St. Columba, Wanstead-slip.

Bateman, Rev. W. H. F., M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Middlegate, York; Vicar of Mexborough, Rotherham.

Beebe, Rev. W. N. P., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Brighton; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Lewes Deanery.

Begg, Rev. Alexander, M.A.; Rector of Usworth, Durham.

Breay, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of Middleton, Kirkby Lonsdale; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Kirkby Lonsdale Deanery.

Colebrooke, Rev. Edward Letherington, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Luke's, Bromley-common.

Collard, Rev. J. M., M.A. Vicar of West Fordington, Dorchester; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Dorchester Deanery.

Cope, Rev. F. L., M.A., Vicar of Bensham, Gateshead; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Gateshead Deanery.

Cropper, Rev. J., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Seaton, Workington; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Maryport Deanery.

Dewé, Rev. Francis J., late Curate of Holy Trinity, Knightsbridge; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chichester.

Dodgson, Rev. F. V., M.A., Curate of Maresfield; Vicar of Tysoe-with-Compton-Wyngates, Warwick.

Ensor, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Rendham, Saxmundham; Vicar of German, Isle of Man.

Evans, Rev. D., Vicar of Penydarren, Merthyr; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Merthyr Deanery.

Firth, Rev. E. H., M.A., Rector of Micheldean, Gloucestershire; Chaplain at Aix-la-Chapelle.

Fisher, Rev. George Wilson; Vicar of Walsgrave-on-Lowe, Coventry.

Foster, Rev. William Hay, M.A., Margate; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Glubb, Rev. John M., M.A., Diocesan Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester; to the Charge of St. Mary's, Cuddington, Worcester Park, Surrey.

Harley-Williams, Rev. F., M.A., Vicar of Lowick, Berwick; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Norham Deanery.

Jackson, Rev. E. H. M., Senior Curate of Wandsworth; Secretary of the National Society for the Deanery of Streatham.

Jackson, Rev. W. Vincent, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Nottingham, and Honorary Canon in Southwell Cathedral; Rector of Bottesford, Nottingham.

Jacob, Rev. D., Curate of Northallerton; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Northallerton Deanery.

Jervis, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Oakington; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Cambridge Deanery.

Jones, Rev. A. J., A.K.C.; Chaplain of Trimulgherry, Deccan.

Knight-Bruce, Right Rev. G. W. H., D.D., late Bishop of Mashonaland; Vicar of Bovey Tracey, Devonshire.

Lushington, Rev. Thomas Godfrey Law, M.A.; Rector of Milstead, Kent.

Maltby, Rev. J. C., M.A., Rector of Apsley Guise, Bletchley; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Fleete Deanery.

Murchison, Rev. Roderick L., M.A., Minor Canon of Bristol Cathedral; Vicar of St. Nicholas's-with-St. Leonard's, Bristol.

Packer, Rev. C., Vicar of Danebridge, Northwich; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Middlewick Deanery.

Padley, Rev. James Sandby, M.A., West Malling; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Peart, Rev. Fiddian E.; Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for the County of Somerset.

Pierson, Rev. W. B., M.A., Vicar of Rothwell, Leeds; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Whitkirk S. Deanery.

Plume, Rev. E. F., M.A., Curate of Settrington, York; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Settrington Deanery.

Powell, Rev. Morgan, Vicar of Aberaman, Aberdare; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Aberdare Deanery.

Pryke, Rev. W. E., M.A., Rector of Marwood, Barnstaple; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Barnstaple Deanery.

Radcliffe, Rev. N. C. W., M.A., Curate of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields; Secretary of the National Society for St. George's, Bloomsbury, Deanery.

Rawstorne, Rev. A. G., M.A., Rector of Croston, Preston; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Leyland Deanery.

Rees, Rev. G. E., Vicar of Harwood, Bolton; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Bolton Deanery North.

Richardson, Rev. W. M., M.A., Vicar of Ponteland, Newcastle; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Corbridge Deanery.

Richmond, Rev. Henry James, M.A., Vicar of Sherburn; Rural Dean of Easington.

Rivington, Rev. Thurston, M.A.; Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Warwick, and Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Warwick; Acting Chaplain to the 2nd Volunteer Battalion, Royal Warwickshire Regiment.

Roe, Rev. R. J., M.A., Rector of Lanteglos; Secretary of the National Society for the Trigg Minor Deanery.

Ryder, Rev. Algernon Charles Dudley, A.M., Rector of Trowbridge, Wilts; Surrogate for the Diocese of Salisbury.

Shields, Rev. Arthur John, Church Missionary Society Association Secretary for Ireland; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Scarborough.

Singleton, Rev. W. F., Vicar of Great Cornard; Secretary of the National Society for the Sudbury Deanery.

Sutton, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bordesley; Vicar of Aston, Birmingham.

Sykes, Rev. E., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Hartlepool; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Hartlepool Deanery.

Thomas, Rev. W., Vicar of Porth, Pontypridd; Honorary Secretary of A.C.S. for the Rhondda Deanery.

Vaughan, Rev. W. Gynne; Vicar of Bettior, Caldewen, Montgomery.

Walker, Rev. Edward Mewburn, M.A.; Rector of Besselsleigh, Berks.

Wardroper, Rev. Arthur S., Vicar of Alwinton-on-Holystone; Vicar of Walker-on-Tyne, Newcastle.

White, Rev. Benjamin Finch, B.A., Curate of Donaghcloney; Incumbent of Inch, Diocese of Down.

White, Rev. Charles Lechmere, B.A.; Vicar of Holy Trinity New Town, Bishop Stortford.

Wilkins, Rev. Nathaniel George, M.A., LL.D.; Rector of Stourmouth, Kent.

Wood, Rev. James Hathorn Roworth; Rector of Thorpe, Newark.

Wortley, Rev. R. W., B.A., Vicar of East and West Rudham; Secretary of the National Society for the Burnham Deanery.

Young, Rev. Hamilton, B.A.; Vicar of Alne, Yorkshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Gypsy-hill, at the Vicarage, Gypsy-hill, on the 19th ult., aged 73.

Baker, Rev. Hugh Lefroy, M.A., Vicar of Wartnaby-with-Grimston, Lincolnshire, on the 20th ult., aged 86.

Collins, Rev. Henry, Rector of Luffincott, on the 22nd ult., aged 46.

Halliwell, Rev. Thomas, 5, Walpole-road, Brighton, on the 25th ult.

Hatchard, Rev. John Alton, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 19th ult., aged 78.

Hemming, Rev. B. F., Rector of Bishop's Cleeve and Stoke Orchard, near Cheltenham, at Weymouth, on Sexagesima Sunday, aged 55.

Smith, Rev. Henry, D.D., Retired Senior Chaplain, Bengal Presidency, at Boscombe House, Boscombe-road, London, W., on the 3rd ult., aged 78.

The Church of England Pulpit.

ST. PAUL'S THEOLOGY.

By the Rev. CANON H. SCOTT-HOLLAND, M.A.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, Sunday, January 27th, 1895.

"But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine: in all things showing thyself a pattern of good works; in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you."—Titus ii. 1, 7, 8.

PERSONALITY, which has always been the key of God's dealings with Israel, from the day when He draws out of the forefront of history the solitary figure of Abraham, and pronounces that all His work for blessing the nations would turn for ever round the significance of that individual name—personality was raised to the highest value in Jesus Christ. Through Him personal character was finally sealed as the seat of all Divine operations, the secret of all purposes and counsels, which had been slowly descending through inner mystery from the foundations of the world. To every problem in every perplexity as to what God is about, there is now discovered to be but one principal solution, but one determining issue. How does this or that which troubles us affect the development of personal character? To expand, to intensify, to enrich, to utilise human personalities—that is the ultimate goal of God. And anything which serves to quicken these into higher and larger activity, or even to enable them to fulfil a better and richer service to mankind, is so far justified. It can be roughly appreciated, it falls within the Divine scheme, it ministers to the final goal of creation. That is our sole and sufficient test of what makes life worth living. It is our proof of what constitutes the reality and value of life itself. If the significance of personal character is carried forward, if its capacities and range are increased, then we can be sure that in spite of hindrance, resistance, struggle, and strife, God's will is holding on its way, God's will is making good its primary intention, it is winning its own victory over pain and trouble and sin, so long as it can bend them still to the fuller development of personal character. We do not inquire, Are men happier for this or for that? That is but an interminable inquiry without any fixed measures, without any absolute logic, without any positive conclusion. We only ask, Is his personal identity verified, is it carried higher, is it rendered more alive, more fine, more pure, more organic, more intense? Then that is enough. That is sufficient justification, for in becoming that it becomes more capable of apprehending and of communing with God. Here is the dominant purpose then of God for man; and the coming of Jesus, in whom that purpose was finally disclosed, showed itself therefore at once in the quickening of human personality. This rose under this inspiration of His presence into unique nobility, and it is under this form that we recognise His followers' inspiration. The impulse derived from immediate contact with the living Master lifted their personal character on to heights unattained and intolerable, from which they saw and spoke, and judged with an authority, which we cannot example. Their whole being in its individual characteristics is elevated, and the force of the inspiration reveals itself in the force of their individual identity. And of this law St. Paul is the supreme illustration. His letters form the main mass of inspired matter, because in him the individuality of the man is raised to the highest and widest value of which it is capable under the action of grace.

It is not enough to regard him, we know, as the channel of inspiration; rather it is that he, Paul, in all his idiosyncrasies, in his personal notes, in his personal affections, in his distinctive temper, is the inspired thing. We watch him, we take note of his peculiarities, of his typical expressions and acts, and manner and habit, as we might study a fascinating drama. Never has an individuality of such astounding force passed across the stage of human history except that of our dear Lord Himself! No other man has so revealed man to himself. John, the blessed lover, goes deeper here and there, and he has special honours of his own, but his range will always be more limited, for there is hardly any whom St. Paul does not cover and absorb. His own private war with the flesh, his own wrestling with the Spirit, his own renewal of grace—it is these in their vividness, their impetus, their intensity which they had in him which have transferred themselves into the universal story. And rightly indeed, therefore, do we celebrate in him alone his conversion, for that most private and intimate secret of his enormous personal experience is itself stamped indelibly into the very substance of our universal life, so that for ever while the world lasts, the drama of St. Paul's salvation will abide as the inspired record, authentic and authoritative, of what the conversion of the human heart must always necessarily mean and be.

Let us turn yet once more, then, within the shadow of his day to consider this wonderful man. What can we note in him to-day which will serve to explain the unparalleled significance of his individual temperament? And I think there is nothing, perhaps, more noticeable and more

surprising in St. Paul than that which is brought to the front in the words of my text—the solidity, the steadiness, the moral healthiness of the character. It is surprising, because there is so much in him which would lead us not to expect just this. We know him in so many forms in which we are accustomed to see the very antithesis of solid moral soundness. We know him, for instance, as the man of vehement passions, of volcanic affection; we follow him in his tempestuous struggles over his churches, his children whom he has begotten in the Lord. Could anything be more ardent, more storm-tossed? He utters all the tones of some passionate lover; he wails and beseeches as a mother bereaved; he agonises over his dear ones; he exhausts language in outbursts of warning; of rebuke, attachment, hope, despair; he is in travail; he groans aloud. Literature records nothing more plaintive, more pathetic, more acute than these cries and pleadings of St. Paul to wayward Galatians or unstable Corinthians—the personal element is so strong, so keen, so tender, so fiery—"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain. Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am, for I am as ye are." "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you and to change my voice." "I would they were cut off who trouble you." "O Corinthians, my mouth is open unto you, my heart is enlarged. Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own affections. Would to God ye would bear with my folly, and indeed bear with me, for I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy; for I espoused you to one husband that I might present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this glorying in the regions of Achaia. Wherefore? Because I love you not? God knoweth."

Vehement, broken utterance, flung out from a heart o'ercharged, how it still carries with it all the burning heart of a love which tosses the apostle to and fro, tumultuous and exhausting and impetuous! Such language as this touches our tenderest sympathies, but we should be prepared to allow for something in it, too, of exaggeration, of disproportion, of excess. Who would dream that this man of overmastering affections, so strained and so extreme, should be the Apostle whose special office it was to assert and expose the fulness of the moral character in all its balanced harmonies, in all its rhythmic proportions. He covers, we know, the entire ethical ground, he omits no factor that has its place in determining disposition or in qualifying conduct, and in all and everything that which he desires and demands is orderliness of control, complete integrity throughout, steadiness, soundness, wholesome sanity, sobriety, equity, practical wisdom, robust manliness. Those are the notes of all his character; that is the type of mind which he would build up in this impulsive text of his. He asks them always for reasonable service, careful and complete service, after the mind of Christ, under the discipline of the Spirit; from his moral ideal everything excessive, everything exaggerated has been totally eliminated, and the sum of the matter afterwards on his lips is this: "Speak thou the things which befit wholesome doctrine."

And yet it is not only his vehement affections that might have seemed to conflict with this type. There was also his keen intellectual subtlety—a subtlety revelling in paradox. His theology, we know, was in the style that built vivid points of contrast. It worked by antithesis. It seized on the absolute contrarieties of abstract positions, ignoring all the mixed complications contrary to human phenomena. It threw out all intermediaries—law and grace, spirit and flesh, faith and works; these are stripped by his vehement thought of all the manifold varieties and multiplications under which they actually present themselves; all our experience on the real scene of life as we feel, and taste and know it. They were analysed down by him to mere abstractions and then subjected to the categories of a rigid dialect, and reduced to their ultimate terms. The spiritual conflict of conscience with sin was dissected and reduced, in spite of all its manifold manifestations to differ in the ineradicable differences which separate person from person, to the garb of a single formula.

Now here was theology indeed, theology masterful, skilful, magnificent, but still liable surely to all the frailties that beset strong theological and dialectical acumen of this kind. This theology will disclose principles, no doubt it will deduce categories; it will unravel logical dilemmas, but in doing so it will, we expect, lose touch with flesh and blood; it will fail to interpret life in the concrete; it will have something inhuman about it, it will fail in pliability, and in elasticity and variety, such as belongs to living, breathing human nature. This is the theology—we know it well—which will try to prove logically beyond what the facts will bear. It will be carried away by its passion for intellectual consistency, which will refuse to observe what conflicts with its conclusions. We all know too well the theology of this abstract order, its excesses, its defects, even in the hands of its most splendid representatives, such as the leaders of the mediæval revival, or still more in the Luthers and Calvins of the Reformation. Such paradoxical and antithetical theology has done excellent work before now, but we have suffered from it. We are on our guard against it. We think it will be partial and one-sided, unbalanced. It will require constant correction by the realities of life. Yes, hardly any one has since kept his head in manipulating this high abstract

thinking. No, not even the great Augustine himself. But look at St. Paul. Take, for instance, the swift passage he makes out of his tremendous dialectical argumentation in the Epistle to the Romans, into those moral counsels of the twelfth chapter, as they are partly given to us in the Gospel for to-day. He has just brought to a close the tremendous energy which he has thrown into analysis of life and history, into that dissection of the spiritual struggle, into his intellectual isolation, into those antithetical principles which can be detected at work within God's age-long purpose for man. And from them in a moment he passes across with his feet on to new ground; here he is dealing straight away with the immediate concrete experiences of every-day facts. He is handling all the details of personal conduct, and with what a breadth he does it; with what reality; with what human heartedness; with what sober-minded anxiety into things as they are; with what immediate instinctive knowledge of the spirit; with what wide and delicate wisdom; with what tender regard for the complete integrity of human nature in all its parts; with what appreciation of the varieties of the incident and the occasion; with what genuine sincerity of touch! Could anything be more close to the actual and the natural? And yet with him all this broad human treatment and conduct follows at once by inevitable sequence on the dogmatic and abstract theology which has preceded it. The two sides to him are not antithetical; they belong to one another. Abstract thinking is at the heart identical with the plainest code of conduct, and therefore, he cries, therefore because of all this dialectical debate, because of this classification of things into their formal categories, as the result of it all, as summed up in that unsearchable purpose of God, which, for all our searching, remains still in its wisdom and knowledge and goodness beyond all our finding out—therefore, I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God which I have disclosed to you, do certain things, certain plain, direct things in your daily practice which are now become your obvious duty. Your God is pure, therefore present your bodies as a living sacrifice, wholly acceptable unto God. That is the right thing to do. It follows at once. That is your sober, rational duty; that is your reasonable service. Let no dialectical subtlety, no brilliant paradox bewitch you into forgetting this. On the contrary, let this enforce that single lesson, Be pure in your bodies, and not the body only, but the mind; train it, transform it, transfer it across from the world to which it had conformed to the new life into which it is now introduced. Take pains about this, watch, consider! Prove, he says, by constant trials and experiment, with consideration, with attention, prove what is the good, the acceptable, the perfect will of God. And then let everyone now take the true measure of himself, soberly and quietly, recognising with absolute coolness his limitations as a member in a vast organised body. Let him be clear what gift he can fitly exercise, and then let him keep wholly within the lines that that gift lays down for him. If he can prophesy, then let him observe the true proportion of things. If he can teach, then let him stick to teaching; if he can minister, let him confine himself to that, and, moreover, let him see to it that he secures that special virtue that befits his case. If he is a giver of alms, let him be sure he has singleness of heart; if a ruler, let him be sure that he has diligence. If he is engaged in works of mercy, let him make sure that he is cheerful; if he has deeds of love to do, let him have sincerity. Then the Apostle goes on to state those things which will fortify the character at every point, and cover the entire ground of conduct, behaviour, and temper and manner, so that at no one point in all the multitudinous occasions which intercourse with his fellows may involve shall this rounded and integral Christian character fail to give proof of its efficiency. They are to be kindly, affectionate one to another, and in honour to give others the lead; they are never to be slothful in affairs while they remain fervent in spirit; they are to rejoice and hope, they are to be patient in tribulation; they are to be inspired in prayer; they are to be given to hospitality; they are always to be sympathetic, whether with those who rejoice or with those who weep; they are to be of the same mind one to another; they are not to go minding high things, but to condescend to men of low estate; not to be wise in their own conceits; to provide things honest in the sight of all men; to recompense no man evil for good; to live peaceably with every one; not to overcome evil with evil, but to overcome evil with good—and so on all through. Could any ethical ideal be more complete, more sane, more wholesome? Nothing is omitted, nothing is one-sided, or partial, or exclusive; all is in balance, all in fitness, governed by a sober judgment under the discipline of all practised wisdom. It reaches this code through the innermost core of spiritual temper, through all the exigencies that belong to action and demonstration, down at last to the very smallest matters of sentiment, of sympathy, and courtesy, and behaviour. Never was the nobility of the perfect gentleman more delicately or more deeply interpreted! And all this by our profound theological student absorbed in abstract analysis, in the intellectual discussion of life, keenly versed in the academic formulæ of rival schools—all this by our Rabbi, who in his logical heat could be charged with having gone mad from too much learning. And take another instance of this temper of his, which might have led us to expect him to be as remote as possible from the type of those who hold above all things by sound and sane ethical teaching. He is, we know, the very Prince and Father of Christian mystics of those who seek inspirations in rapid

intuition, in visions, in trances. Physically, he had their nervous organisation, which can under its strain of excitement lay itself easily open to the imputation of disease, and to the suggestion of epilepsy. He had exaltations, he had visions which struck him blind; trances in which he had no food for three days; revelations in which there fell from his eyes, the blinded eyes, as it were, scales. He had dreams and appearances that came to him in the ecstacy of prayer; voices that spoke to him alone; mystical directions to go here, and not there; he did miracles; he spoke with tongues; he prophesied; he followed signs and tokens; he foresaw in dreams all that would happen in a shipwreck; he was lifted into conditions in which he knew not whether he was in the body or out of the body; and in the transfiguration he was caught up into the third heaven, and heard things unspeakable, which it is not lawful to utter. .

And so again, in the recoil from these exaltations, he was the man who could be cast down into the deepest depression, into moods of misery, half physical, half mental, when he became an object of pity to his humblest followers, and he himself almost feared contempt. He could wander about like one distraught, having no rest in his spirit, pressed above his strength, insomuch that he despaired even of life; he had the sickness of death in him, he had a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan sent to buffet him. And all this high-strung, sensitive, infirm, sickly nature he had to carry through life, battered and bruised and torn and mangled, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, in loneliness, in cruelty, in bitter despondence, in wars, in cares, in betrayals, until he deemed himself to be as a mere outcast, as the filth and off-scouring that is flung into some pit, yea, as the very dung of the earth. Such a character, such a life, in its fiery heights, in its awful darknesses of shadow, in its storm and stress, in its tragic strife, in its mysterious depths of mystic power—such a character we could love well enough, and could follow with clinging wonder, and could picture in all its vivid and dramatic fascination. But there is just one thing that we should never expect from it—we should never suppose that it would prove itself the great master in the life of ethical duty, of moral obligations to its fellows; nor should we ever have guessed that the peculiar note of all his last teaching should be summed up in the words which during his old age were always on his lips —were words that always mean health—moral health, healthiness of tone, healthiness of disposition, healthiness of doctrine—these, through all his later epistles, written as he draws to his death —these are his constant requirement. To his children in the faith he has this one message to deliver, which they must hold when he is gone. To Timothy, to Titus, it is always the same— "Speak thou the things which belong to sound, healthy teaching." This doctrine of Christ, worked out by him through such infinite struggle of intellectual argument, had this absolute characteristic by which it distinguished itself from all else for him, that it was morally wholesome, it was sound, it was sane, it was honourable, it was whole, it was manly, it was robust. Health was the supreme mark, health of the organic body, health, therefore, of coherent and combined parts, balanced, proportioned, rational, restrained. The true doctrine entrusted to those his own sons whom he has begotten could not, he assures them, but show itself in the sound and solid consistency of the entire manhood, in the sober, self-controlled government of the complete being, putting out its full distribution of capacities in their order of appointed harmony towards noble ends. False teaching, he told them, would always upset this health; that would be its note and mark under all its vagaries; it would distort the harmony of Christian character; it would throw this combination out of its balance, out of working order, out of control. Good doctrine means sound conduct, means fair, wholesome living.

That, beloved, is the last word of the dying Apostle to the Church, to you and to me. That is the conclusion of the whole matter. Why is it that we have failed him? Why is it that this sound doctrine, this orthodoxy, as it shows itself through us, fails to carry with it the associations that are so proper to its nature? This word orthodox ought, as it falls on men's ears, to suggest above all things that which is healthy, hearty, large-minded, generous, free. It ought to imply of necessity moral integrity, a man in whom nothing is cramped, one-sided, or partial. It is the heretic who runs up with a lop-sided half of the truth, who exaggerates, who is blinded by pride, who sees one-half to the exclusion of another, and destroys the balance of ordered proof. It is the heretic who is unhealthy and unwholesome, because he is unequally developed. The orthodox is the man, according to St. Paul, who takes this large measure of human nature, who considers proportion and avoids temporary excesses; who is honourable, steady, and firm; and all this he is because of his firm intellectual grasp on that complete conception of the new manhood as it is given him in Jesus Christ, under the systematic fulness of body and stature which is preserved to him through the concerted ministries of the Catholic Church.

My brethren. we know how we have fallen from our privileges. Let us to-day once more be roused by the name of St. Paul to better endeavours; let us brace ourselves to the task of winning back its true significance of orthodoxy. We have got to prove to men that it means the very opposite to narrowness, one-sidedness, moral weakness. We have got to convince them, by the undeniable evidence of our lives, that it involves this soundness

of heart, this wholesomeness of tone, this fulness and steadiness of character, this graciousness and charm of moral health. If we were true to St. Paul, it would be clear beyond a doubt that dogmatic certainty, dogmatic precision, dogmatic passion for the truth of Christ, are the natural and essential grounds of all that is fine and pure in character and conduct—all these long list of virtues that he unrolls, which terrify us by the multitude of their demands, which he felt to be but the ever-varying expression of one single principle. Once confess the truth, once learn Christ, if so be that we have heard of Him as St. Paul has taught Him, and have become taught by Him in the faith of Christianity, then it becomes obvious and necessary that we should be created in righteousness, and holiness, and truth. Wherefore, as an inevitable consequence, we should, of course, put away lying and speak truth with our neighbour. What else could we do? We should stand in awe and sin not; the sun would never go down upon our wrath; we should never give place to the devil; we should, if we had stolen, steal no more, but work with our hands that which is good for the sake of giving to him that needeth, and no evil communications would ever proceed out of our mouths; we should never grieve the Holy Spirit, and bitterness and wrath, and anger and clamour, and evil-speaking and all malice, would be at once put away from us, and fornification and uncleanness would not be so much as named among us, nor filthiness, nor foolish talking, and we should have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. All this would be ours, and we should walk not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, and as we walked we should be making melody in our hearts to the Lord, and we should walk in love and always be giving thanks unto God our Father, and we should prove and detect what is acceptable unto the Lord, and we should be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving, even as God for Christ's sake has forgiven us. That is orthodoxy. Who would complain of it if it were like that? All that is so, and all that St. Paul is not afraid to ask of you and of me, if only we hold the sound doctrine, is without it impossible, incredible, it would be a swarm of separate precepts, how could we ever keep them? Quite possible, quite credible to keep them all if they are but various ways of saying over and over again one and the same thing, "We have the mind of Jesus Christ."

THE Missions to Seamen is appealing for funds to enable it to erect on a site adjoining its large institute at Poplar, opened last June by the Prince and Princess of Wales, a seamen's church for the exclusive use of sailors frequenting the port of London. The church is to be built in memory of the late Rev. R. B. Boyer, for thirty-seven years chaplain and superintendent of the society.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF INVESTMENTS.

BY DR. T. C. FRY, HEAD MASTER OF BERKHAMSTED SCHOOL.

SERMON PREACHED IN ALL SAINTS' CHURCH, MARGARET-STREET, AT NOON, DECEMBER 12TH, 1894, IN CONNECTION WITH THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UNION.

"Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness."—ST. LUKE xvi. 9.

I MET a priest of the Church of God this summer who told me that his reason for not joining the Christian Social Union was this, that he could not belong to such a society without overhauling his investments—his American investments, for instance. How was he to know that the dividends were justly earned by the *employés*, and were justly paid to them? Now the strange thing is that he did not see that his Christianity demanded this of him, that a profession of religion was inconsistent with carelessness in such a matter. And this story surely illustrates the need of a society such as I am speaking for to-day, not to replace the Church, of course, but to emphasise the social teachings which the Church of to-day has often forgotten; and it also illustrates, I think, the special need of dwelling upon this question of investments for Christian people, for here was a priest who had some reputation for preaching, and who was trying to live up to his conception of religion, to whose mind the question of investment had not presented itself as anything more than the concern of a voluntary Church Society.

Let us see whether it be more or no. In the first place, just consider the enormous power of capital. Taking capital in the commercial sense as that which aids in the production and transport of commodities for us consumers, just consider its power. Labour, if unorganised, is absolutely powerless against it. If it were not for the barrier set up by the organisation of labour, wages would be only just above the famine line. Not only has capital, gathering as it does into a few hands, this wrecking power against labour, if it chooses to exercise it—which it generally does—broken only by labour's organised resistance, but it has a growing power as against the ordinary consumer. In America capital is organising itself into vast trusts, or, as they call them, combines, which secure a monopoly of some much-needed thing, and so secure prices against competition, and secure it in the interest of the big capitalist, and not of the labourer; while even competition still secures the capitalist to a great extent against a rise of wages. Thus you have before you the position of workers without any capital, a condition of things which has been produced by the industrial revolution of this century. These men and women no longer own any part of the implements or tools of produc-

tion; they have no reserve fund out of which they can buy them. They are reduced to the position of mere creators of a wealth of which many of them have a very insufficient share. You have a vast output created by the combined brain and hands of the community. Through this output you have a great income, what we may call a national dividend, paid by the daily labour of all who work. The interest upon investment is a first charge on this dividend, so is rent. No question of the division of wages and profits can arise till this first charge is paid.

Now let us, beloved, take that point first. Every idle man, every idle woman, living on interest and making no return to the community in some form of active work, whatever that work may be, is as much a burden upon the workers as the willing vagrant who frequents the roads. Sometimes the idler is represented as a kind of benefactor who is assisting production by lending his capital at interest. You will, I think, soon see through this if you try to realise what would become of the idler if he did not lend it. Why, to live he or she would have to spend it, and he only saves it from destruction by the labour of those who make it fruitful to him. It is surely as clear as day that the religion of Christ, as taught even in the Church Catechism, forbids this idler to exist. Of course, a man or woman may do unpaid work. A woman who lives on her interest, and devotes herself, for instance, to organising Women's Trade Unions for their protection, or poor girls' clubs, or things of that kind, is really repaying to the community her debt. All I say is, this debt she must pay. The idle girl who confines her activities to her own social amusement, the idle woman or man who takes and does not give—to these the Catholic Church has no message but one of stern social condemnation. But beyond this first charge on national labour comes a further question—it is the division of wages and profits. The more Profits get, the less Wages can get out of that division. The less Wages get, the worse is the house, the worse is the food, the worse is the life. So you see in these two points our difficulty comes out plain. The more interest and rent there is, the less there is to divide between Wages and Profits; and the more Profits get out of what is left, the less Wages can secure.

When you have money invested, or money to invest, and you hear of a really first-class investment, what does it mean? It generally means a secure investment, with a good dividend (*good* dividend). How good? Why, a good big dividend! But if the dividend is large, those profits must be large. Then how about wages? Now is it a Christian duty to care how men and women live, whether they have enough to live on, time to rest, air fit to breathe, freedom from the awful temptation to increase their wages by sinful methods? Of course it is a Christian duty. We support all kinds of societies for curing all kinds of social evils. But here a prior question meets us: Is it possible that we are profiting by any of these evils indirectly, that our good dividend, our rent, our rate of interest, is creating some of them?

Oh, beloved, what a thought of judgment before the Eternal Throne comes across the page of our City quotations! Surely we are bound to ask what wages our profits make possible! Then, again, we are bound to ask how the money is made. What Christian could invest in a gin-palace and profess indifference to the use that was being made of his money? Who could draw a huge benefit from some music-hall without assuring himself as to its influence? Then why do we not see that it is equally our duty to inquire into the sanitation, and hours, and meals, and Christian regard for the circumstances of *employés*? For instance, we may have shares in a big shop. Does that shop sweat? Does it cut down its wages as near as it can to the line of necessity? If so, are we harassing the directors about it, attending shareholders' meetings, and denouncing the usury in it?

Or we own railway shares. What of our signalman's hours? Oh! what can we small people do? Do? All reforms have been begun out of the protests of small people. We can do all and more than I have said above; we can support in public and private a policy that makes these things impossible. I heard a Church dignitary, at a dinner-party, once say that life would not be worth living if employers were to be asked questions such as these. Apparently it did not occur to him that life might then be better worth living by the workers.

There is another point we should consider. Can we safely, for instance, hold a share in foreign loans? Does not that largely depend on how those loans are spent and raised? If they were wasted, like the Egyptian loans, and if they are raised out of an oppressed and unbenefited nation, we cannot rightly hold them. We can only hold them when we can assure ourselves that they have really served to benefit men, and are not being exorbitantly paid for.

Now, to sum up what has been said in a few principles: 1. That we have no business to be supported by other people; that we must return in labour, in self-devotion, somehow, to the whole community, what we have received; that we must not be pauper casuals in all but the name. 2. That we must never inquire, first, for a good dividend, but first for the conditions under which the investment is worked; and if we ever find that the one we hold is paying us too well and the workers too little, then, if we continue to hold it, we must return it to them through their clubs, their medical societies, and through open criticisms of the policy. 3. That we must hold no investment where we cannot discover these things, especially if the dividend be good, 4. That we must hold no investment that is built up in any way upon the degradation or the oppression of any who help to pay it. 5. That

we must support every progressive measure, even at our own cost, that uplifts the fallen and the weak. That so doing we may, so long as capital is individualised, avoid some of our worst evils.

You will say justly, But how am I to know these conditions? To that I would certainly answer, If your mind accepts these principles, then aid us by joining this Christian Social Union, not because we need members, for we are growing as fast as any body ought to grow, but because you will aid us and yourselves to come to a source whence we can learn and are learning the very things our conscience seeks upon these questions; we can have advice how to proceed as investigators to discover these things; we can be put into touch with the men and the women who know these things; and we can learn how best to raise out of an evil environment those whose labour is undoubtedly supporting us.

And, brethren, may I, as a stranger, urge you not to treat this question as a matter of interesting or funny discussion? I speak as an optimist, but it would be folly to hide the conviction that the outlook is grave. The evils of our social life are very great, the contrasts are intolerable. We need energy, sympathy, knowledge, and conscience. There is another alternative in front of us, an alternative that comes at times like a darkening shadow across the future of the nation; and the bayonet and the baton will not save society. It can only be saved, as it has been saved before, by the Christian spirit of love and self-sacrifice. It is better, far better, to live poor than to be rich off the overmastering toils of the poor. It is better, far better, that fewer should be rich and more should be happier. It is a Christian solution to work for the community rather than for the individual. The Church of Christ's earliest experiments, the history of the great Orders, the life of Christ Himself, forbids us to say that there is no such thing as Christian Socialism. The time will be some day when capital itself may be largely socialised, and such investments really cease. But till then, if that then is to be, let us at least make sure that no sovereign of our own is wet with tears or black with unrewarded toil!

AN interesting obituary notice of the late Mr. Ewan Christian, the architect, appears in the *Record*. Mr. Christian, says the writer, cared nothing for the amusements or diversions in which many hard-working men seek recreation. This he found chiefly in the contemplation of Nature in all her varying moods; in a summer holiday spent among moors or mountains, or in a winter morning's walk on Hampstead Heath, where he had built himself a house, he found exhilaration and repose; and Nature, as a kindly mother, repaid her dutiful child by endowing him with length of years and excellent health, and wonderful vigour of mind and body. When over eighty he climbed into the roof a church with such steady hand and active foot as surprised the men who held the ladder below.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1895.

THE NEW LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

THE result of the London County Council election is extraordinary and unprecedented. What its administrative effect may be can only be guessed. It must be remembered that, in spite of their heavy losses, the Progressives have still a majority, for nine Progressive Aldermen retain office until 1896. The Progressives thus reap the advantage of their unscrupulous abuse, protested against by their own party journals, of a provision intended to secure fair-play on both sides. Nine new Aldermen will have to be elected, and over this the first fight will, no doubt, take place. One Progressive suggestion is that a compromise should be effected, and five Progressives chosen to four Moderates. This modest offer simply means that the Progressives, being only one-half the Council, should make up two-thirds of the Aldermen for the next three years at least, having already claimed all but two or three for the last six. In other words, the verdict of the elections would be stultified. This will hardly do. A compromise will no doubt be the issue, but the terms must be much more favourable to the Moderates.

The significance of the voting is great, but not as great as might be supposed. Comparatively little public interest was taken in the contest, considering the noisy preliminaries. A little extra enthusiasm was displayed by the Moderates, who increased their poll by 5,000, while the Progressive poll fell off by 27,000. On the whole, the additional votes cast do not account for all the new voters. The inference seems to be that the Progressives reached high-water mark in 1892, and that their victory was due to Moderate abstentions. They have failed to improve, or even to maintain,

their position, while the Moderates have brought up reserve forces enough to sweep away the old majority against them, tremendous as it was. The aggregate of the voting shows this more clearly—260,135 for Moderates, 241,246 for the Progressives, a Moderate aggregate majority of 18,889. The appeal to aggregates is of variable value; the Progressives derived much consolation from it in the School Board election, we question if they will now, for the conclusion is irresistible, that the more voters can be brought to the poll, the stronger is the position of the Moderates. The Progressives have not lost by any succession of accidents, actually their numerical position on the Council is considerably better than it ought to be on the strength of the voting. Their discomfiture is complete.

The reason is not far to seek. No one denies that many of the Progressives are actuated by good motives, and have done much good work. But their methods have been bad, and the extravagance of their claims has made us doubt their principles. For instance, their constant cry for more powers has wearied people. Their absurd claim to manage and control every institution in the capital of the Empire has made us inclined to look upon them as a pack of busy-bodies—perhaps unfairly. Some of their methods, as the inquiry into the way in which the park-gardeners spent their spare time, were opposed to English principles. And the threatened persecution and vilification of hard-working men for spending their leisure in the industries they liked best was quite contrary to all British notions of liberty and independence. This inquisition alone did the Progressives much harm. And the multiplication of duties and offices upon the Council gave a sort of idea that it was Jack-of-all-trades and master of none. A municipal body is not required to take over the duties of chief employer of labour and manager of every trade. The result has been bad for the Council and for the ratepayers. When a firm like Mowlem & Co., while treating its men with perfect fairness, can tender for public works at something like 30 per cent. under the Council's estimates, we feel that something must be wrong. And our confidence is not increased by the proceedings of the Works Committee, which, for election purposes, claimed to have done its work at a great saving upon its own estimates, while suppressing the tenders. It is obvious that you can claim to save if you first argely over-estimate the cost.

The tall talk of many Progressives has also done much to lose them public confidence. We are not Socialists, and never shall be. We do not wish to plunder and exterminate the ground landlord and capitalist. We are anxious for all kinds of improvements, but we do not wish to gain them at the expense of others. No more do all the Progressives, but some talk as if they did. The intolerance and bigotry of the Progressive Press, which has denied any virtue at all to the opponents of its policy, has much to answer for in this. To sum up all, we should be inclined to say that of late the Progressives have become un-English in language and methods, and partly so in conduct, and that has been their ruin. Certain principles are dear to the Englishman, and he distrusts any men who seem to run counter to them. In this election the Moderates seemed to better represent English thought and feeling, and therefore they have won.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE living of Aston, Birmingham, has at length been accepted by the Rev. Henry Sutton, vicar of Holy Trinity, Bordesley. Mr. Sutton is a thorough-going Evangelical, but it is to be presumed that he will not wish to interfere with the existing musical services, repugnance to which led Mr. F. S. Webster to decline the living. Holy Trinity, Bordesley, will be remembered as the scene of the labours of Mr. Enraght, whose prosecution and imprisonment for illegal ritual was one of the Church Association's achievements many years ago.

Bishop Knight-Bruce, late of Mashonaland, has not only accepted the vacant Devonshire living of Bovey Tracey, but has become Assistant-Bishop of Exeter. Bishop Bickersteth, in the course of a Lenten Pastoral, speaks of the necessity of his hands being strengthened "by the vigorous aid of a younger coadjutor." The new Assistant-Bishop is not more than forty-two years of age. His type of Churchmanship is not precisely Dr. Bickersteth's, but as neither is an extreme man, and both are zealous in all good works, they will doubtless get on well together.

Prebendary Webb-Peploe's final refusal of the vicarage of Sheffield was reported early this week, having been announced by himself from the pulpit of St. Paul's, Onslow Gardens. Mr. Webb-Peploe is the only clergyman, we believe, in the rural deanery of Kensington who still preaches in the black gown, and he is about to take a vote of his congregation as to whether they wish him to continue the practice or adopt the surplice, like his brethren. The congregation will also be asked whether they would prefer to have the Psalms chanted at the Sunday evening service or read, as they are at present.

The Golden Lecture, to which, as recently stated, the Rev. A. Boyd Carpenter has been appointed, will, under a new arrangement, be delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral on the last Tuesday of each month at half-past one. Mr. Carpenter gave his first lecture this week, in pursuance of the new scheme.

The London Diocesan Church Reading Union has arranged for a course of mid-day lectures on "Great Workers in the Reformation in England," to be delivered at St. Bartholomew's Church, Moorfields, on the Fridays in Lent, at half-past one. The lecturers in order will be the Rev. Professor Collins, Canon Mason, Archdeacon Sinclair, Canon Benham, and the Rev. H. Gee.

The Bishop of London has just admitted Mr. John Ogle and Mr. Charles E. Cæsar to the office of Diocesan Lay Reader. Mr. Ogle has been licensed to St. Stephen-the-Martyr, Portland-town, and Mr.

Cæsar to St. Paul's Canonbury. One of the earliest appointed of the diocesan readers, Mr. Edward Clifford, is announced to preach at St Bride's, Fleet Street, to-morrow evening.

Lord Halifax will hardly find his *Church Times* pleasant reading this week. His recent speech advocating union with Rome, is mercilessly attacked by High Churchmen, whose fidelity to Catholic principles is as unimpeachable as his own. If the Pope is still expecting the Ritualists to go over in a body, in spite of Cardinal Vaughan's warning to the contrary, he should be supplied with a translation of some of the letters which the utterances of the President of the E.C.U. have called forth.

Bishop Wilkinson, of Northern Europe, who knows more of the Roman Church abroad than Lord Halifax, is evidently not in a mood for re-union. He has asked the Anglican chaplains on the Continent to discuss, at their annual conference in June, the question, "How to meet the present aggressiveness of the Church of Rome." Papers on the subject will be read by Dr. Noyes, of Paris, and Mr. Fry, of Boulogne.

There is an article in the *Contemporary Review* for March which should certainly be read by those Churchmen who have taken interest in the consecration of a bishop for the Spanish Reformed Church, whether on one side or the other. It is entitled, "Experiences of an Anglican Catholic," and professes to narrate how the writer, holding extreme views on the claims of the Catholic Church in any country where it happens to be represented, was led during a long sojourn in Spain to make his submission to Rome, though he was powerfully attracted to the Spanish Protestants by their piety and conformity to Anglican ways. He is then represented to have removed to Russia, and to have felt himself constrained by his principles to repudiate Rome and join the Orthodox Church. He finally came back to England, rejoicing that he is still a good Catholic, in his own sense, and very angry with the Archbishop of Dublin for consecrating Señor Cabrera.

We are not, of course, expected to receive the story as a narrative of actual experience, but it does put in a telling way, though with grievous faults of taste, the embarrassment in which an Anglican who thinks himself obliged when abroad to acknowledge the branch of the Catholic Church which he finds established, may easily be involved. It is more than implied that an English clergyman, whose identity is hardly veiled, sanctioned the writer's submission to Rome while in Spain. If this is true, it ought to have been stated with the guarantee of a responsible name; if it is not true, the insinuation is unpardonable.

A Church Aid Society for Central London has been formed. Prebendary Kempe is president, the Rev. J. F. Kitto and Prebendary Richards vice-presidents, the latter being also treasurer, and the Rev. J. H. Cardwell honorary clerical secretary. The object is to enable the parishes within the three deaneries of St. James's, Westminster, St. Martin-in-the-Fields, and Bloomsbury, to help one another by sympathy and encouragement in organising their work according to the best methods, and by providing means for the maintenance of a sufficient staff of clergy and lay helpers.

In view of coming discussions, we may note that Chancellor Dibdin has just published (Gordon, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street) "The Church Patronage Bill, 1895, with introduction, notes, and index." The pamphlet costs 1s. only.

THE PATH OF SAFETY FOR THE DOUBTFUL.

By the Rev. Prebendary REYNOLDS.

Delivered at St. Anne and St. Agnes, Gresham Street, E.C. (being one of a Series of Wednesday Science Lectures, at 1.15 p.m.).

"Our eyes are holden that we cannot see things that stare us in the face, until the hour arrives when the mind is ripened; then we behold them, and the time when we saw them not is like a dream."

Ralph Waldo Emerson—*Essays: Spiritual Laws.*

Leonardo da Vinci, the celebrated painter, in his last illness, was visited by Francis I., and it is said, in honour of the artist, that he died in the monarch's arms. Is it possible for an honest, truth-seeking, God-serving man to find a Path of Safety through the doubts, difficulties, dangers of life? Can he, at the end of his mortal existence, embraced in the Everlasting Arms, and resting on the Eternal Bosom, say, in the words and name of the Lord Jesus, "Father, I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do"?

Christians, preach the Gospel to every creature, and we know, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." We are sure that every wilfully impenitent man subjects himself to infinite peril. We are not now, however, dealing with Christians. Some persons are brought up ungodly, or are, in early life, almost self-destroyed by evil living. Others, who are not aborted in person, inherit from secular parents a blind mental character, and are almost impotent as to spiritual capacity, or insight, concerning the beauty and power of Christian Faith. Is it possible, by any earnest appeal to head and heart, so to move them that, being led to seek the truth in Jesus Christ, they find it and are saved? All things are said to be possible in nature; certainly all things are possible to God, therefore we will do our best possible with the means and time at hand.

There are a few impossibles, with regard to unbelief, to be laid aside as not knowable. Take two of them. First, it is impossible to prove that there is no God. To give proof, we should have to be present everywhere, and always with infinite power of discernment. Were we absent one moment in all time, or before or after time; absent from one even tiniest space of the infinitude—within that moment, in that space, the Eternal God might be gloriously or secretly present. Second, it is impossible to prove that the dead cannot and will not live again. We need not think of special cases of dead men found to be alive. That we are alive, now, once, is a fact; and to every reasonable person, who has sufficiently thought of it, the present life is a harder thought and a greater mystery than the idea of a second life sometime, somewhere. You are here; it is impossible to be sure that you shall not be somewhere else.

Certainly, we are not in safety if we live wilfully apart from God, and think to die as if there were no future.

Take now a Universal Truth.

We men are able greatly to change things, bend them to our purpose, use and misuse; but we cannot destroy any particle of matter, any, even the smallest force; nor can we turn either of them out of the universe. You may separate two powerfully attracting

atoms ; you can break fragments into invisible morsels, and dissipate the force so that no instrument can detect either, but, though unseen and quite unfelt, they exist not less large, not less real. You may call, if you will, the used matter and force which you have sent to play in the viewless winds, angels or demons, as you happen to be sacred or profane ; but call them what you will, or call not at all, they have further parts now to play, and other parts when the now is gone. They are like the fabled Eastern magicians who changed themselves into many forms, but were careful never to disappear altogether.

Take a Particular and Personal Truth.

Alive this day, as you are, it took all the past of the present world to shape, or misshape you. Here you are, bad or good, and you can no more separate yourself from the universal system, power, life, purpose, than you can put an extinguisher on the sun. Your energy in doing work, or causing motion, is in part diffused, part turned into heat ; but none is lost, other work will be done, and that soon. It is impossible to take you out of the past ; all the world had the making of you. It is impossible to take you out of the future ; all the world has the keeping of you. All the stuff in you, bad or good, will come again, bad or good. The corruptible must put on incorruption, the mortal must put on immortality. Every bit of your physical force, or mental strength, will reappear, no one knows how soon, in some time and place. Suppose you can catch and stop the earth with your hand, and so use her forces that you send her on another, an opposite, flight. When she has gone her utmost fling there will be a pause ; and on her return she will regather all the force that seemed to be lost, and go on the old way again with the same elastic force of spring and energy of motion.

We have taken things in twos. Two Impossibles : you cannot show that God is not ; nor are you able to show the dead are dead. Then we had two Truths. One was universal : you cannot annihilate either matter or force. The other was particular and personal as to yourself : you are unable, do what you will, to separate yourself from the future. As the past made you what you are, the present will certainly determine you in the time to come. You may wriggle about, shut your eyes, be drunk, mad, devilish, with all the fury of unbelief ; but things are as they are, and will greatly be as you make them. It is better to be a wise man, living and dying, than be a fool in both.

Now the Path of Safety.

For all evils is a remedy, present or future ; but every evil, despite the remedy, makes a charge for itself and enforces payment: but, on the whole, we know malady has a cure, night is followed by day, and death always carries the dead into new places and conditions. These natural and material truths and events are representative of the forces, whether good or evi , but not the very forces. The forces, even when they seem most majestic and terrible, grow out of atomic, molecular, etherial, atmospheric, electrical, magnetic vibrations, exceedingly minute. These so pervade space and all objects that, while everything has its own distinctness, that distinctness is inseparable from the universe, is kept with it, and led on to some great purpose, because there is a reason in and for everything.

This reasonableness of purpose and this distinctness of being, working with grandness yet minuteness of forces, are in analogy with our own physical, mental, spiritual, moral processes, and with our individual personality. Our life-throb responds to a throb in the universal medium. Our intelligence is woven of the light and intelligibleness of nature at large and of its distinctive parts. Our sense of right and wrong, of God, of responsibility, of good and evil, is related to the light and dark, the healthful and noxious, the hoped-for and dreaded, the freedom and service, that we find in the world. Our faith in God is a higher, grander, more sacred influence than our trust in nature and confidence in man. Our sense, or consciousness, of God in Christ, healing and saving us by a pervading divinity of life, sacredness, and restorative influence, is in analogy with every recuperative, physical, vital, mental, moral force, at work in every man. Our sense of a judgment to come is an extension and intension of that selecting and rejecting natural process everywhere, whereby the useful advances and the useless or hurtful is laid aside and condemned.

These forms of thought, made accurate by attention, enlarged by knowledge, acted on conscientiously, are by further comings of Divine grace and help, if you prayerfully desire and seek, transformed into God's gift of Faith. Then a man believing has the witness in himself, and knows that he has passed from death unto life. Soon, seeing the wonderfulness of Jesus as the Christ of God, he partakes of that Divine operation by which the Lord was born, and is himself born of God Thus, partaker of the Heavenly Nature, as God's child he overcomes the world, is set free from sin, and knows that through believing he is saved and has eternal life (1 John v. 1-5, 9-11). He has received what antiquity termed, "The medicine of a blessed immortality, the antidote of death." He knows that the Son of God hath come, and given him an understanding that he may know the truth,

["The Making of Mind" will be the subject of the next lecture.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE CHURCH AND ITS MEMBERS.

SIR,—The Rev. W. T. Hobson cannot understand that the Church is God's plan to guide our race from evil, and informs us in your number of the 2nd inst. that the Church is "a congregation of human beings." Surely it is something more than this, for a congregation of human beings might be composed of a company of heathen people assembled together to worship their idols. It appears to me the reverend gentleman should make a distinction between the Church and its members. For instance, the Church is a plan or a system given by God to direct our race, and therefore a faithful congregation cannot be the Church, but are, I believe, the members of it. The Church, as a system, was established after the disobedience of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, as recorded at Genesis iii. 15 ; and let us consider how its laws were particularly given to Moses. To be a faithful member of the Church, then, is to worship the Lord according to His Holy Word. As to your correspondent's words in your issue of the 16th ult., which he quoted from the 55th Canon, "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church," I know of no such teaching in the Bible. How can it be otherwise, when the Church is

God's dispensation, and therefore infallible for good, and consequently can need no prayers to be offered up for it? As to its infallibility, let us observe our Lord's words at Matt. xvi. 18: "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." We gather from the Bible that it is good for the members of the Church to pray for one another. It seems to me to say the plan of salvation, as ordered in the Bible, is language easy to be understood.

That I am not singular in describing the Church as God's plan to redeem man from sin, if the reverend gentlemen refers to Webster's Condensed Dictionary, published by J. S. Virtue & Co., under the word "Theism," he will find one meaning given for the word theology—"The plan of salvation."

In conclusion, I will ask the question, If God's law in the time of Moses was sufficient to direct the people for their good, why is not God's law, as placed before us in the Bible, sufficient in these our present days to direct man in the way of righteousness? Let us notice how our Lord and Saviour in His ministry referred to the Old Testament, showing that God's law to man is a written testimony (John xx. 30, 31). St. Paul, at Col. ii. 20-22, warns us not to be led away to place our trust in ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men. We have the example of those of Berea, as recorded at Acts xvii. 11, to teach us to rely upon the Scriptures in deciding upon doctrine.

J. T. DOCKER.

Worthing, March, 1895.

SIR,—I have been from home, and now have two numbers of the PULPIT before me. With respect to Mr. Sandland's questions, there are some who are disposed to date the foundation of the Christian Church from our Lord's commission to the disciples delivered just before His ascension; others date it from the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost following. The difference is not essential. However this is regarded, there was the fulfilment of His promise: "On this rock I will build My Church." What is patent and clear, as matter of actual fact, is that, ever since the Day of Pentecost, there has been the Christian Church, and that entrance into that society has been by or in baptism, and not otherwise. As for Mr. Sandland's second question, he must have forgotten Acts ii. 41 when he asked it.

Your correspondent is quite welcome to accuse me of evasion, etc., if he thinks such accusation consistent with truth, which is matter of opinion, and if he thinks it consistent with politeness, which is also matter of opinion. But I object to being told that I am trying to lay down the law. What I think concerning the Church is not peculiar to myself; millions think the same. I leave laying down the law to Mr. Hobson, who says that the Church is all wheat and no tares, contrary to all Scripture analogy, and directly contrary to the Scripture from which the metaphor is taken.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

March 4th.

DR. DAVIDSON ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SIR,—A new edition, "revised and improved" of Dr. Davidson's "Introduction to the New Testament" has recently been published. Amongst other things, we are told that "the Apocalypse did not assume its present form till the reign of Hadrian"—that is, not until A.D. 117—138. Now I venture to ask, What other form could the Apocylypse ever have possessed, seeing that it is such a perfect and symmetrical gem—such a work of consummate art, constructed throughout with reference to the sacred numbers three and seven, and having the end so exactly corresponding to the beginning as to form a complete circle? It is plainly no patchwork, no mixed composition, but one carefully planned, proportioned, perfect organic whole, written by one author, a most devout Jew, who had become a most devoted Christian, and who recognised that Christianity not only fulfilled all the aspirations of the Judaism which was visibly passing away, but was also destined to overthrow the cruel, cold-blooded, dominant paganism, and to go on conquering and to conquer for the blessing of mankind.

Moreover, there is the closest connection in tone and spirit, imagery, standpoint, not to mention language, between the Apocalypse and St. Matthew's Gospel, which even heresiarchs like Baur and Strauss acknowledge as the earliest of all the four Gospels, and which, as the internal evidence clearly shows, could only belong to the period of the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.

Add to this that M. Renan finds in the Apocalyse the echoes of the Neronian persecution, which occurred in A.D. 64.

What, then, can be said of Dr. Davidson's "revised and improved" conclusions, except that, inasmuch as they contradict ascertained facts, they need still further revision and improvement, and must be rejected by all students who are searching for truth.

H. HEBER EVANS.

March 1st, 1895.

THE CREEDS.

SIR,—The Creed, called the Apostles', was compiled by degrees, and was not composed by the Apostles—a poetic idea—according to Rufinus, about A.D. 345, at Aquileia, who said each Apostle wrote or inserted a clause, which cannot be correct. And besides, in the earliest known forms the sentence, "He descended into hell," was unknown.

The Creed, called the Nicæan, was compiled about 325, and principally by St. Athanasius. At this period there were many views expressed as to the procession of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and these opinions are scattered about in what may be called a casual way in the writings of many people, but in no case did it ever assume a dogmatic assertion as to the "filioque." The Nicene Creed does not assert the descent into hell, and is the only Creed positively drawn up by a council.

The Creed, called after St. Athanasius, was never heard of till A.D. 800 or so. The Spanish king Reccared had on his own account accepted the "filioque," and, through him, Paulinus of Aquileia under the influence of Charlemagne, followed suit, and drew up the Creed, which was also strengthened by Alcinus' work on the Trinity. This so-called creed of St. Athanasius is not only false in title, but has never received the assent of any Œcumenical Council.

Now, if all the foregoing be correct, why do people ever trouble themselves to reject the creed on the damnatory clauses, especially when God's Word says, 'The wicked shall be turned into hell," and when the

Church affirms the same in the Commination Service?

Why is not the objection raised to it on the true and reasonable ground, viz., it was not drawn up by St. Athanasius or confirmed by any Œcumenical Council.

C. J. W.

P.S.—I suppose the objection to the Athanasian Creed really arises from the expression, "This is the *Catholic* faith."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adams, Rev. H. F. S., Rector of Branston, Lincoln; Vicar of St. Paul's, Stratford, E.

Allen, Rev. D. Frazer, Curate of St. Philip's, Newcastle; Curate-in-Charge of St. Wulstan's, Selly Oak.

Allum, Rev. A. Standley; Vicar of St. Alban's, Kimberley, Griqualand West.

Balleine, Rev. A. J., Curate of Yardley; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Isle of Jersey.

Brown, Rev. Herbert, late a Missionary of the Church Missionary Society in North India; Vicar of St. Lawrence and All Saints', Steeple, with Stansgate, Maldon, Essex.

Buss, Rev. A. C., M.A.; Curate-in-Charge of Kroonstad, Orange Free State.

Campbell, Rev. H. E., M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Millom; Rector of Workington.

Cardwell, Rev. J. H., M.A., Rector of St. Anne's, Soho; Secretary of the National Society for the St. Martin's-in-the-Fields Deanery.

Carter, Rev. Francis Edward, M.A.; Tait Missioner and Six-Preacher in Canterbury Cathedral.

Clemens, Rev. A. R., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Bethnal-green; Chaplain to the Lord Mayor.

Collom, Rev. C. F., B.A.; Mission Priest for the District of Hay and Herbert, Griqualand West.

Colvin, Rev. William Evans, A.M.; Incumbent of Dromard, Diocese of Killala.

Cooper, Rev. W. H. Windle, M.A., Curate of Christchurch, Hants; Rector of All Saints', Southampton.

Curling, Rev. J. J., M.A., Vicar of Hamble; Organising Secretary for the S.P.G. for the Diocese of Winchester.

Dodgson, Rev. S. H., M.A., Curate of Suckley; Vicar of Vowchurch, Herefordshire.

Down, Rev. W. J., Vicar of St. Luke's, Dudley; Secretary of the National Society for the Dudley Deanery.

Fernie, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Wellingore; Vicar of Burton-by-Lincoln.

Finch-White, Rev. B., Curate of Waringstown; Incumbent of Inch, Diocese of Down.

Gordon, Rev. Robert Whittaker, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Stockport; Vicar of Christ Church, Colne, Lancashire.

Greer, Rev. J. Bolton, Rector of Tulla and Feakle, Diocese of Killaloe; Rural Dean of Traddery.

Griffiths, Rev. W.; Mission Priest for Klipdam and District, Griqualand West.

Herbert, Rev. David, B.A., Curate of Carnarvon; Rector of Llandyssilio-with-Menai Bridge.

Horsley, Rev. Hugh, M.A.; Vicar of Oulton, Stone, Staffordshire.

Husband, Rev. J. R., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Swithun's, Bournemouth; Rector of Laverstoke, Whitchurch, Hants.

Jackson, Rev. Henry Latimer, M.A.; Vicar of St. Mary-with-St. Benedict's, Huntingdon.

King, Rev. Samuel W., A.M.; Incumbent of Kilsicly and Clonlea, Diocese of Killaloe.

Lancaster, Rev. Edgar; Assistant-Curate of St. John's, Mafeteng, Basutoland.

Lang, Rev. W. H.; Curate in-Charge of Dosthill, Kingsbury.

Macnamara, Rev. Henry Danvers, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, with St. Michael's, Queenhythe, London; Priest in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Madge, Rev. J. T., M.A., Rector of Littleton, Hants; Rector of St. Swithun's, Winchester.

Mansel-Pleydell, Rev. J. C. M., Rector of Bengeo, Herts; Rector of Branston, Lincoln.

Minns, Rev. G. W. W., LL.B., Vicar of Weston; Secretary of the National Society for the Southampton Deanery.

Mitchell, Rev. John, Curate of Christ Church, Penrith; Perpetual Curate of Wythop, Cockermouth.

Nevill, Rev. R. W., M.A., Vicar of Hook-with-Warssah; Secretary of the National Society for the Alverstoke Deanery.

Newling, Rev. William Edgar, Vicar of Clandown; Vicar of Midsomer Norton, Bath.

Nixon, Rev. Eckersall, Rector of Ettagh-with-Kilcolman; Canon of Clondegad in Killaloe Cathedral.

Norden, Rev. H. L.; Honorary Chaplain to the Missions to Seamen for the Shipping on the Orwell, and at Harwich.

Ouvry, Rev. J. D., M.A., Rector of Helston; Honorary R. D. Secretary of the Church Army in the Deanery of Newark.

Preedy, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Plymouth; Vicar of Saltash, Cornwall.

Richards, Rev. H. W., M.A., Vicar of Scaldwell; Secretary of the National Society for the Rothwell Deanery (Third Portion).

Richardson, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of Brislington; to the Lectureship of Brislington.

Scratchley, Rev. C. E., M.A.; Rector of St. Stephen's, Vryburg, British Bechuanaland.

Shone, Rev. S. A., LL.D.; Chaplain to the Royal Naval Barracks, Devonport.

Strong, Rev. Charles; Vicar of Christ Church, Windhill, Shipley, Yorkshire.

Troutbeck, Rev. John, M.A., D.D., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, and Minor Canon; Precentor of Westminster Abbey.

Vaughan, Rev. C. M.; Chaplain to the *Empress of India*.

Waugh, Ven. Archdeacon A. T., M.A.; Vicar of Nidd, Ripley, Yorkshire.

Wilkinson, Rev. W. F., M.A., Vicar of Great Easton; Secretary of the National Society for the Gartree Deanery (Third Portion).

Williams, Rev. W. Ll., the Priory, Carnarvon; Secretary of the National Society for the Arfon Deanery (Carnarvon Division).

Williams, Rev. W. T., B.A., Rector of Bradfield; Secretary of the National Society for the Horningsheath Deanery.

Wilson, Rev. R. V.; Chaptain to the *Crescent*.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barrett, Rev. Henry Alfred, at Chedgrave Rectory, Norwich, on the 27th ult., aged 81.

Bridges, Rev. Sir Thomas Pym, Bart., at Danbury Rectory, Chelmsford, on the 28th ult., aged 89.

Crawley, Rev. Henry, forty-six years Rector of this Parish, at the Rectory, Stowe-nine-Churches, on the 1st inst., aged 82.

Green, Rev. John, M.A., formerly Vicar of Christ Church, Cockermouth, at Delhi House, Streatham, on the 27th ult., aged 69.

Hamilton, Rev. James Milne, M.A., late Vicar of Ridgmount, at Foulislea, Ampthill, on the 28th ult., aged 62.

Hughes, Rev. James, for fifty-two years Rector of the Parish, at Llanhilleth Rectory, Crumlin, Monmouthshire, on the 3rd inst., aged 80.

Jones, Rev. Samuel Flood, M.A., Precentor of Westminster Abbey, Vicar of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, and Priest-in-Ordinary to the Queen, at the Cloisters, Westminster Abbey, on the 26th ult., aged 68.

Orton, Rev. John Swaffield, twenty-nine years Rector of Beeston, near Mileham, at Worthing, on the 24th ult., aged 57.

Packer, Rev. Richard Waldegrave, forty-six years Vicar of Witcham, Ely, at 52, Romola-road, Herne-hill, on the 4th inst., aged 76.

Philpott, Rev. John, for fifty-eight years Rector of the Parish, at Hinxhill Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 86.

Stacey, Rev. John Thomas Cyril, M.A., Merton College, Oxon, at Southam de-la-Bere, Gloucestershire, on the 25th ult., aged 67.

Tonge, Rev. Richard, M.A., Honorary Canon of Manchester, and Rector of St. Anne and St. Mary's, Manchester, at Chorlton-cum-Hardy, on the 1st inst., aged 68.

Turner, Rev. Herbert Charles, M.A., Vicar of Fenton and Rural Dean of Stoke-upon-Trent, on the 25th ult., aged 52.

White, Rev. Thomas, formerly Vicar of Kirk Hammerton and Rector of Cowthorpe, Yorkshire, at Doncaster, on the 5th ult., aged 93.

Wynell-Mayow, Rev. Mayow, of Bray, Cornwall, and Braeside, Devizes, at 7, College-terrace, Southampton, on the 26th ult. aged 84.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THREE INSPIRED POETS.

By Ven. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday Afternoon, January 27th, 1895.

". . . As certain even of your own poets have said, For we also are His offspring."—Acts xvii. 28.

IT is inevitable that in sermons which occupy but a brief time we must often touch but slightly on subjects of vast extent. Two Sundays ago I tried to show you, by transcripts from actual human lives, the comfort of God's Holy Word. Last Sunday I gave you a few instances out of many of the way in which the Bible, and the Bible only, had emancipated nations from brutal savagery or stifling superstition. To-day I can but indicate, rather than evince to you, how the thoughts of God uttered for us in Scripture are also reverberated in thousands of mighty echoes in the noblest human souls. Inspiration awakens inspiration. It is only a narrow dogma, contrary to Scripture itself, which confines inspiration to Holy Writ. The Bible teaches us that there is a light which lighteth every man who is born into the world; that wisdom is the breath of the power of God and a pure effluence from the glory of the Almighty; that being from above she can do all things, and remaining in herself, making all things new, and in all ages entering in the holy souls, maketh them friends of God and prophets. Every good gift and every perfect boon—and therefore the good gift and perfect boon of the highest literature—is from above. If the Apostle Paul, speaking to the philosophers at Athens, as seen from my text, modifies his own teaching by a quotation from third-rate Greek poets like Aratus and Callimachus, I need no apology if I try to show you how the lessons we learn from the best Scriptures may be deepened and illumined in our minds, not only by sickly and womanly manuals of hysterical unreality, but by thoughts that burn, uttered by noble and manly men. I might throw a sweeping glance over the developments of great Christian literature, but as this would be impossible, I will confine myself to three of the mightest names. From the writings of the Fathers, if I could touch upon them, I might single out for you the "Confessions" of St Augustine, and his diffuse yet striking "City of God." From the writings of the scholastic epoch I might at least select the "Imitation of Christ," or the sermons of St. Bernard; but when once the Renaissance began to burst asunder the brazen gates and iron bars of Roman tyranny, there are multitudes of great books. If I only select three writers, I shall still have a far larger subject than I could properly compress into many sermons. Those three writers shall be poets, because it is the poets who more than all others have been in all ages also the great moral prophets, and because none have equalled them as the teachers of the worthiest part of mankind, of all that is great in conduct and pure in thought. A recent beloved and charming critic, Matthew Arnold, when asked by a friend what propped his mind in these bad days, pointed him to Homer, to Sophocles, and to the noble Stoic moralist Epictetus; and the poet Wordsworth, a man of purest intellect and sincere holiness, mentioning books as one of the chief sources of his happiness, points to Spenser's "Fairy Queen" and to Shakespeare's "Othello," and says—

> Two shall be named pre-eminently dear,
> The gentle lady married to the Moor,
> And heavenly Una, with her milk-white lamb.

And in this bad age of greed, of struggle, of unbelief, and retrograde religious pettiness, if I were asked the same question, I would answer that, next to Scripture, there are three lofty souls to whom I incessantly turn. From the cruel baseness of egotism and the suffocating fumes of superstition I turn to them, as it were, and feel a breeze of heaven blowing through the darkness of a charnel-house. Next to Scripture, amid the cruel, crawling foam of human contemporary life, I look up to, and am supported by, three writers, who shine as moral lighthouses in a dark and stormy sea. In them, among the fevers and appetites on every side—in them, among mobbing spectres and gibbering voices, I find magnanimous and princely men. They show me how gracious a thing is man when he is but a man. Next to Scripture, they bring me back from despair of what Man is to knowledge of what Man may be; next to Scripture, they bring me back to God Himself. I have the authority of a saint for saying so:

> "Yes! Write it on the rack," St. Bernard said,
> "Grave it on brass with adamantine pen,
> 'Tis God Himself becomes apparent when
> God's wisdom and God's goodness are displayed."

For God these attributes are made—Wisdom and Goodness.

I find them supremely in Holy Scripture, and most of all in the teachings of Christ and of His Apostles and Evangelists. I find them also echoed and reflected from Him and from them in those glorious souls which His Holy Spirit illuminated. In the religious oracles now most in vogue I find very little of either. Read the Bible, read the works of those great immortals, and you will hardly care to dissipate your intelligence and dwarf your

ideal on what Mr. Lowell called "The stagnant goose-pond of village gossip." "Hang this picture on your wall," said an Oxford tradesman as he handed to a silly undergraduate a Madonna of Raphael; "Hang this picture on the wall of your room, and it will put to flight your coloured prints of jockeys and ballet-girls." And I would say to all the young here, read these immortals and you will soon learn to turn with silent contempt from prurient novels and betting newspapers, from ebullitions of spite and falsehood, and from the namby-pamby euphemism of unhealthy sentiment. You will turn from the dust which, as you heard in the lesson, is the serpent's meat, to things more worthy of the soul of Man.

I begin with Dante. His date is easy to remember. It was in the year 1300 that he began his Divine Comedy which gave voice to a thousand years. Though Dante wrote before the Reformation, the dross of Romish error bears a very trivial proportion to the glory of his works. It is impossible to say how great has been the influence of his poem in his supreme, holy, incomparable grandeur. O youthful heart, happy as yet, uncontaminated by corroding worldliness, would you learn how much greater you are than you know how far better worthy than to sell your soul for a mess of red pottage, then let this poem of Dante's awaken your soul by its intense solemnity of the unseen and the eternal—it will be like a Doric strain, upraising you from ignobleness. It is only according to the letter that the subject of the Divine Comedy is the state of man's soul after death; in its true meaning it describes man as liable to the reward or punishment of eternal law according as by the freedom of his will he is of good or ill desert. It represents with wholesome sternness and brevity the life-history of a human soul, redeemed from sin and error, from lust and Mammon, and restored to the right path by the reason and grace which enable it to see the things that are, and to see them as they are. The "Inferno" is no mere slaughter-house of everlasting vivisection; it is the expression of sin as the punishment of sin and of a bad heart as its own hell. The three great divisions of the poem might be called not Hell, Purgatory, Paradise, but rather Guilt, Penitence, Regeneration. Hell is to Dante self without God; and it may be that many here present may at this moment in the reality of things be in that which Dante meant by Hell. Penitence is the return to God, and we may trust that many here present are even now toiling up the steep mountain terraces of that holy hill. Heaven is self-annihilated and lost in God; it is the state of meek, pure, beautiful, holy souls, and we may hope at least that here and there one, it may be unnoticed and unknown, making, it may be, but little profession, hiding deep the light which it contains, wearing no broad phylacteries, goes to heaven every day. To every one who knows how to read this great poem aright, there is scarcely a single high truth of God's Holy Word which it does not unfold more forcibly ten thousandfold than all those petty tinklings of arrogant ignorance which in these days deliver brawling judgments all day long on all things unashamed.

If Dante expressed the voice of religion at its best, our own myriad-minded Shakespeare, the most uniquely gifted of the sons of men, gave voice to that new youth of humanity, which, after a dreary epoch, in which men had been bound hand and foot in the fetters of a corrupt priesthood, culminated in the revival of learning, in the invention of printing, in the discovery of America, in gradual reawakening of the human mind from its lethargy and darkness. Under a dominant ecclesiasticism science had been menaced, progress checked, originality frowned upon, truth and independence burnt at stakes and flung to rot in dungeons. Already in Dante the grey secret of a more splendid day had begun to burn into crimson dawn; but now with the Renaissance and the Reformation awoke the sense of manhood, the sense of a youth renewed like the eagle's, breaking loose from the lies and forgeries which were the title deeds of Papal tyranny, the breaking up of the fountains of the great type of human personality, the sweet odour of the returning Gospel, embathing men's souls in the fragrancy of heaven. If you read Shakespeare only as a dramatist you must read him altogether. At his best, and in many a play, he is one of the deepest souls, the most delightful of moral teachers. Read his plays in chronological order—from the gay, airy, fantastic laughter of "Love's Labour Lost," to the wild tumult of "King Lear" and the mellow wisdom of "The Tempest"—and you may trace the upward movement of a soul most royally endowed. To Shakespeare it has been given, as it was given to few living men, to "see life steadily and to see it whole." Goethe rightly wrote of his plays, "They are much more than poems. The reader seems to have before him the books of Fate, against which is beating the tempest of evil life so as to drive the leaves backward and forward with violence." Take but two instances. See with what splendid precision he sets forth in "King Lear," that tragedy of tragedy, the great truth that in this life Faith, indomitable Faith, must still burn bright, and triumph over apparently irremedial failure. It is the lesson of the Psalmist, of Job, of the noblest chapters in the Book of Daniel, of the Apostles of the Apocalypse; yes, it is the one great lesson of Christ Himself. A lovelier picture of womanly faith and tenderness than Goneril even Shakespeare never drew. Dr. Johnson was so disappointed at the tragic ending of the play that he would not even read it a second time, and Nahum Tate altered it for the stage; but the conception of Shakespeare was far sublimer and more true to life. Sacrificial love like

Cordelia's is above all reward; it looks for and receives, like martyrdom itself, something far higher than earthly rewards; nay, whether it glow in light or quench in darkness, it is itself its own exceeding great reward. There lies Cordelia strangled, and the poor mad king tears his white locks, and sobs his last, over her murdered corpse. Yet faith and love triumph. We would rather be Cordelia strangled in prison than Goneril and Regan, even had they died in their polluted royalty; we would rather suffer with innocent Desdemona, and with rash but honest Othello, than triumph with the thrice-accursed Iago. The righteous have never set their hearts on the success and praise of men, and rarely do they attain it; but they do attain what is dearer and more eternal, a serene conscience and a tranquil assurance that all must be well with those who are supported by eternal laws. Read, again, the tragedy of "Macbeth." It sets before us in lurid imagination the horrors of an avenging conscience; it is a great presentment of the eternal tragedy of the guilty soul; it is the story of crime through all its stages, temptation, glamour, the spasm of a guilty act, the agony of awakement, the haunting of shame, the permanence of horror, and, last of all, in due time, retributive catastrophe and unutterable despair. And here, too, we see the same great lesson as in "King Lear"—that it is better to be the humblest, honest crossing-sweeper than to be the most splendid of guilty kings. I would far rather be gracious Duncan, lying there foully murdered, than be his murderer, whose red blood not all the ocean's water could wash clean.

The third supreme author to whom, next to Scripture, I would direct you when you desire to escape out of the sewers of life into its sanctuaries is Milton. I cannot speak of his noble prose works, of his soul animating sonnets, or of those Orphic songs indeed, those songs Divine, of high and passionate thoughts, by their own music chanted, too stately and too noble for the minds which fed like a serpent on the dust of slander and frivolity – the "Paradise Lost" and the "Paradise Regained"; but let me touch for one moment on one of his earliest poems—"Comus," and on his latest, "Samson Agonistes." Take "Comus"; this loveliest of poems was written while Milton was still a young man, but it illustrates the intensity of his love for all moral beauty. It is a poem on the irresistible might and loveliness of youthful chastity. Oh, you who are young, who may be haply tempted by the poisonous cup of Circe and the seductive song of the Sirens, read it, re-read it, for it was written by one whose soul was like a star, and whose voice like the sea, one who lived in the high and continual belief that wh re-ever he was, wherever he might be, though he might escape the eyes of man, he could never escape the eyes of God. "Comus," apart from its exquisite music and beauty, abounds in thoughts which, if you could grasp them, would be a life long treasure and a safeguard. I might quote scores, but take this:

> He that has light within his own clear soul
> May sit at the centre and enjoy bright day;
> But he that hides a dark soul and foul thoughts
> Benighted walks under the mid-day sun—
> Himself is his own dungeon.

The lesson of "Comus" is the primary conviction of Milton's life, that if the love of God is fire sent from heaven to be for ever kept alive at the altars of our hearts, the first principle of all godly and virtuous action, then to refrain from unjust honouring of ourselves is the second, the fountain-head whence every laudable and worthy enterprise may spring. Turn from "Comus" to the last work of Milton, the statuesque and Greek-like tragedy of "Samson Agonistes." In that he also shows the same lessons of faith ultimately triumphant even in the midst of immeasurable calamity, in its disdainful rejection of everything wrong, and in its own self-restraint. The "Samson Agonistes" has been compared to a white statue by the hand of Phidias, yet it throbs with a passion too deep for utterance. It has been called the thundering reverberation of a mighty spirit. The poet is even greater than his poem. He was old, he was blind, he was poor, he was hopeless, he was undefended, his friends were dead, his enemies triumphant, his principles execrated, his name infamously calumniated, his cause in ruins; he had witnessed the entire conflagration of his life-long hopes; the age of Oliver Cromwell had been succeeded by the age of Charles II.; for Milton and Andrew Marvel you had Tom Brown and Tom D'Urfey and private infamies, unblushing lechery, unblushing and unashamed, and crawling flunkeyism. England had reverted from the purer, nobler manhood of Puritanism to the wallowing of the swine; and yet Milton bated no jot of heart or hope. He not only struggles, with but he defies and rises victorious over all these storms of Destiny, and he closes his life and monumental drama with the "Sampson Agonistes," the word of faith and hope. Thus did Milton, in the midst of the burning, fiery furnace, with no angel of the dew beside him to cool its flame, still say to his soul that God was true. Amid the loss of all, Milton was still Milton. A wilderness of Charles II.'s and Tom D'Urfeys could not rob him of that eternal heritage. He would endure all that evil deeds and evil tongues could inflict upon him, because he had himself a better portion and an abiding one.

I would invite you to read the works of such men, but you must rise to them, they will not stoop to you; they will indulge in no pranks or vagaries to captivate you; they will never deign to grasp ignoble hands in order merely to gain your suffrages. In them you will learn and find

contempt of everything mean and sordid, disdain for popularity, sedate grandeur, energy kept in its high and spacious armoury, until the signal for action is given. Are you sick of the noisy, and the polluted, and the mean? Is your soul wearied by the fussy, the foolish, the corrupt and the contemptible? Are you wearied with the still worse companionship of your own impure and grovelling thoughts? Lo! these poets, these gentle and royal souls await you with their garlands and singing robes about them; hand in hand with them you may tread the heaven's azure, and stand amid the innumerable company of angels who cast their crowns of amaranth before the sapphire throne. St. Paul bade the Athenians listen to their own poets, so I would invite you to let great poets like these infect you with their radiant cheerfulness, inspire you with their indomitable hope, breathe into your troubled souls their high serenity and fortitude of faith; they will help you to believe in God, to believe in conscience, to believe in duty.

And so by these sunbeams you will be enabled to climb to the Father of the righteous. Their lofty teaching is but the vestibule to a still diviner temple. They will teach you how transcendentally above themselves, above the mightiest of the mighty, and the reflected goodness of the holiest, stands the one and only perfect Man, the Lord Christ our Saviour, the Lord of Light and Life, the Lord of Time and all the worlds, the Son of God, immortal Love. They will help to lead you to Him, until, disregarding all else that the world can give, you shall say from your inmost heart: "Lord, to whom shall we turn? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life."

CHRIST'S PRESENCE AND CHRISTIAN FASTING.

By the Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church.

Sermon Preached at Christ Church, Oxford, on Ash Wednesday.

"Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast."—Matt. ix. 15.

THE real difficulty of these words is masked by their apparent easiness. We see at once a meaning in them, and we scarcely stop to ask whether it is their whole or true meaning. If we do so stop and try to think them out, we may find them harder and more mysterious than we imagined.

I.—They were spoken in answer to a criticism upon Christ's disciples—a charge of laxity, of careless self-gratifying, of a low standard in regard to religious duties. Our Lord had taken His place as a prophet, as a religious teacher; yet in those who followed Him most closely, and who were likely to display most clearly and fully what His teaching came to in practice, men looked in vain for some of the most approved signs of a religious revival. At the moment the defect was emphasised by contrast; for the disciples of John and of the Pharisees were actually keeping a fast at the very time when Jesus and His disciples were taking part in the great feast which St. Matthew had prepared for them, and that in company which aggravated the look of indifference. It was not unnatural that the question should be raised on the part of St. John's disciples, with some hint of aggrieved virtue. "Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but Thy disciples fast not?"

Our Saviour answers in the words of the text. They are in form metaphorical; but the meaning of the metaphor is clear; the difficulty does not lie in reading it into plain terms. What it conveys is this: that the disciples are His closest friends and companions, and that it is unreasonable to expect them to mourn and fast while He is with them, in the gladness of His company; but that a time is coming when He will be taken from them; and then, after He is gone, they will fast.

The first impression which the words give, the impression which is reproduced in most commentaries, is simple and natural. It is that the disciples are having their bright time now, and that it would be hard to overcloud it with any austerity; that their dark time will come presently, when Christ will have been crucified, and they will be left to mourn His absence; and that then, when they will sorrowfully miss Him, it will be appropriate for them to fast. With this interpretation the words seem coherent and easy to understand. The difficulty comes when we compare what they would thus mean with the actual experience and bearing of the Apostles after our Lord was taken from them. For He plainly speaks here of two tracts of time; the time during which He stays with them, and the time after that, when He will have left them: we cannot imagine that He merely meant that they would mourn and fast during the few hours between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, or that the annual commemoration of those hours should be marked by fasting. "The days will come when the Bridegroom shall have taken away from them, and then will they fast in those days." We can hardly doubt that it is to the long course of time after His withdrawal from this earth that He is pointing; to the experience of the Church in the Apostolic age, and, it seems natural to believe, in the ages that have followed it. But if, with this thought in our minds, we turn to the Acts of the Apostles and to their letters, a deep and broad contrast comes before us. Are these the men who were to mourn over their Master's absence, to fast because they missed Him so sadly,

to go about life with the heavy pain of loss and desolation in their hearts, to look back sorrowfully from their time of gloom and fasting to the bygone brightness of the former days when the Bridegroom was still with them? Surely such a description is profoundly and utterly unlike the actual temper, and aspect, and language of the Apostles. So far from being darkened by the sadness of Christ's absence, their life was radiant with the certainty of His presence; so far from mourning that He was not with them, they were rejoicing that He was; so far from being impoverished, they were richer than before; so far from looking back to a past brightness and nearness of companionship, they knew Him in a way that surpassed all knowing "after the flesh;" and they looked forward to "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" in perfect union with Him. From His Ascension they return to Jerusalem with great joy: such joy stands next to love in the fruit of the Spirit they receive; nor is it ever wholly quelled in them. If ever a promise was made good to the uttermost it was our Saviour's promise to His disciples: "I will not leave you desolate: I will come to you;" and "I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." Men widely different in character and temperament come before us in the Book of the Acts and the Epistles—men of like passions, like moods, and difficulties with ourselves; but one mood we never find in Christ's Apostles; the mood of gloomy retrospect, of mourning for a bygone happiness, of desolate regret for a lost Friend and Master. The mourning and fasting which were to be theirs when Christ had been taken from them cannot have been meant to express any sorrow of that sort.

II.—What, then, was to be the motive and meaning of the fasting to which he pointed? What was the mourning which could not begin till He was parted from them; the mourning they should learn when He was gone? If His going was to be their gain, if they were to be more closely joined to Him, more richly blessed in Him, more certainly upheld by His indwelling, after His departure than before it, then what did He mean by saying that they could not mourn while He was with them; but that the days would come when He should have been taken from them, and then should they fast in those days?

The words were plainly mysterious. They were among those sayings which were hidden from the hearers, which concerned a state of things for which their minds as yet had no capacity, nor terms, nor organ of apprehension; and, as our Saviour spoke, His eyes were resting on a scene, a life which none save He could see, or, as yet, even be informed of. The life His servants should attain when He had been taken from them, when he had ascended into heaven, and the Holy Ghost had come—that life would have joys and sorrows, lights and shadows, privileges and demands, of which at yet they could neither form nor receive the thoughs. They could not imagine what it would be to know Christ not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; to dwell in Him and to have Him dwelling in them; to live a life that was hid with Christ in God, a life from which old things were passed away, and in which all things were become new. Even the very happiness of Christ's bodily presence with them, of natural friendship and companionship with Him, must have made it harder to understand or anticipate at all that higher, deeper, closer union which was to be realised when He should have been taken from them. And so they could be told that they would fast in those days; they could not be told the conditions which were to give occasion, character, purpose to their fasting. The bare fact could be prophesied, but not the altered life, the spiritual environment, the new creation, which would make the fact far different from all that they and those around them thought of. The outward act of fasting might remain unchanged; the abstinence practised, for instance, in the Church at Antioch, or by St. Paul, might in appearance differ little, if at all, from the abstinence practised by the disciples of St. John the Baptist; but it would draw its motives and its meaning out of conditions that neither they nor Christ's disciples could forecast. It would, indeed, as He implied, spring out of the fact that He would then have been taken from them; but it would be reached through other changes following on that fact: changes which would make His going to be their blessing; changes which would make His going to be their blessing; changes about which they could not be taught. And so there was in our Lord's words a reserve such as is often inevitable in an advancing revelation. He told one fact, one thing which should be: He did not tell other things which would be found to modify and transform its character when the time came. It was true that the fasting of the children of the bride-chamber would follow on and be linked with the Bridegroom's being taken from them; but in His taking from them, in all that great sequence of events which St. Luke gathers into the phrase, "The days of His being received up" (St. Luke ix. 51), there were included changes which would give to their consequent fasting a character that could not be imagined till it was attained.

III.—What, then, is that character? What are the reasons and the notes to be derived for our fasting out of the fact that Christ has been taken from us; that He has died and risen again; that He has ascended into heaven; that we may know Him now, have fellowship with Him now, spiritually and not not naturally, through the power of the Holy Ghost, and not after the flesh?

Surely the first reason, the first note, is found in the very words we use. Our fellowship with Him, our knowledge of Him, our discernment of His

presence and His power is now spiritual and not natural. Let us recall St. Paul's words: "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more" (2 Cor. v. 16, R.V.). And let us listen to what is, I think, a very just expansion of those words:—

> There are some of us (St. Paul seems to say) who have known Christ after the flesh; but now, if we have really passed into the eternal kingdom, we know Him in quite another way. What does it matter that we remember His face, His voice, His manner, His dress? To us He is not, first of all, a fellow-countryman, a fellow-townsman, a man who lived in the next street, whom we used to see in the synagogue on the Sabbath, and whose brothers, and sisters, and friends we knew; or a wonderful religious teacher who, in our presence, said many wonderful things and did many wonderful works. He is the Eternal Son of God; Brother of all men. His earthly life has passed into a larger, mightier, and more glorious life. . . . . And now we meet Him not in the weakness of His flesh, but in the power of His eternal glory.—R. W. Dale, "Fellowship with Christ," pp. 39, 40.

That knowledge, ranked by St. Paul so high above the natural, ordinary acquaintance with Christ, which many in his day had had, is the knowledge to which we are called. It is the only real knowledge we can have of Him, even as it is the only knowledge which in the last resort will really help us. We may without difficulty know a good deal about Him; there are plenty of books to help us in that way, and we may study His life minutely as an "august and pathetic tradition." But that is not what we ultimately need; it is not knowing Him. If we are to know Him it must be spiritually; and spiritual knowledge does not come naturally to us. It involves much, demands much. And if we reflect we shall see, I think, that extreme comfort, and unstinted amusement, and constant society, and needless abundance of pleasant food and wine are not favourable to it. It is not in the midst of these things that we are most apt and best able to lift up our hearts unto the Lord; to realise the unseen; to have our conversation in heaven; to see clearly what most of all concerns us, what will alone concern us in the least when this life ends; to enter into the order of the spiritual world; to know the things that are freely given to us of God. The highest exercise of the spirtual faculty does not rise out of the fullest satisfaction of the bodily life—rather, unless men have strangely and persistently misread experience, it is when the body is refrained, and its desires chastened, and its appetites disciplined, that the spirit gains liberty, strength, and insight. (Cf. J. H. Newman, "Parochial and Plain Sermons," vi. 30, 31.) It is not generally out of secure, and comfortable, and easy circumstances, that we grow most sensitive to the things that are spiritually discerned; it is more often through suffering and sorrow that men wake to find the reality of communion with Christ. It is the poor of this world, or those who come as near to them as they can—the poor in spirit – who are rich in faith. Even as the things of God sometimes grow clearer and clearer as old age advances, and men grow—

> "Sensible of fires that more and more
> Visit a soul, in passage to the sky,
> Left nakeder than when flesh-robe was new."
> R. Browning: "Poetical Works," X., 80, Cf. VII., 128.

Since Christ has been taken from us and received up into heaven, since it is in the Spirit that we must seek His face, and hear His voice, it is well to take some care that the comforts and pleasures of this earth shall not close us in and make us dull and satisfied upon a low level. It is well to deny ourselves some ease, and smoothness, and enjoyment, that we may move more freely where He is.

And then we may discover also what that mourning is which He forecast as following His withdrawal from the earth. For in whatever measure we attain to know Him we shall realise the wonder of His love; and therefore we shall also feel, as we have never felt before, the misery of that which holds us back from Him, the shamefulness, and cruelty, and bitterness of sin. The sense of that great love of His, which sin has scorned and wounded, the experience of joy in that knowledge of His love, from which sin drags us down—these are springs of real contrition, of mourning such as He Himself has told us shall be blessed. "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." That surely is a true history of penitence, of the shadows that do not come till the brightness of His presence is about us; of the mourning that the children of the bride-chamber should learn when the Bridegroom had passed from them into heaven, and they had received grace to ascend thither in heart and mind It is no idle, faithless grief because He is not with us, but a deep and fruitful sorrow for the sins that so often check our recognition of His presence, the sins that are so strange and terrible an answer to His love. May He help us in this Lent so to deny ourselves that we may rise and move forward in the knowledge of Him, Who loved us and gave Himself for us, and that we may really mourn for our sins and make up our minds by His grace to deal frankly and firmly with them; so that of His mercy we may seek forgiveness for them, and that when the cry is heard, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet Him," we may rise to welcome Him for Whom, unworthy as we are, we still have tried to work, and wait, and watch.

WE are promised a volume of "Memories" of the life and work of the late Archdeacon and Vicar of Sheffield, Dr. Blakeney. The Rev. W. Odom, Vicar of Heeley, has undertaken to prepare the volume for publication, and the first chapter, dealing with Dr. Blakeney's earlier years, up to the time of his ordination, will be from the pen of Mrs. Blakeney.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper shoul be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1895.

FASTING AND ABSTINENCE.

THE Archbishop of York has been giving counsel about fasting. His Grace is known as a pronounced High Churchman, almost too high, but in this matter he takes a common-sense view which readily commends itself. He holds that the Church enjoins the devotional exercise of some spiritual discipline, but has not confined it within specified and unalterable limits. Evidently the Archbishop is not of those who, in the columns of the *Church Times*, and elsewhere, advocate harking back to early mediæval practices, and would keep up a literal fast.

It is true that, in so doing, they can claim support from the Tractarians. Pusey was in favour of literal abstinence, and Keble fasted with austerity, Both held that this literal observance was of benefit, and such saintly leaders and fathers in the Church ought to be sure guides. And yet we make bold to doubt. Occasionally, and in individual cases, there may be advantage, but the general principle of bodily abstinence seems to have worked out its original purpose, and to be founded now upon a wrong premiss.

In earlier days, when all who could afford it, consumed beef and beer three or four times a day, the beef often salt and the beer always strong, regular periods of abstinence may well have been beneficial, as well to the body as the soul. A mediæval dietary could well have borne a little cutting down and alteration. But those days are over. Some gluttons and gross feeders are still among us—by all means let them fast. But for the majority of people diet is more wholesome and less copious than it used to be. Our dishes are more varied, better cooked, and more cleanly served; our liquors and our habits of drinking are, in the same way, altered in the main for the better, though there is still work for the C.E.T.S. And there is not the same point in abstinence when comparatively few people take too much. The general moderation of appetite which now prevails, justified by the decrease of epidemics and a lower death rate, is really the end sought for, in a rather clumsy fashion, by the ancient practice, which has now served its purpose. For the rest, fasting is based upon the wrong premiss, that what is bad for the body is good for the soul. In the olden time this was generally accepted as a truth. The body was literally mortified. It was reduced to feebleness by penances and penalties, by hardship and starvation, in order to complete the triumph of the soul. Of course this was in flat opposition to the *mens sana in corpore sano* principle, and sanity was not the commonest characteristic of the ascetics. But now this premiss has been dropped and the fallacy admitted. But with it goes the principle of abstinence, which is retained by a queer sort of compromise, in which logic goes to the wall.

Romanists, for instance, and a certain number of Anglicans, partially adhere to the ancient custom. In point of health they show no superiority over their non-abstaining fellow-citizens. The other way rather, judging from the dispensations which are occasionally granted, half seriously, by some of our bishops, and which have lately come wholesale from the Pope. These dispensations are granted on the score of prevalent sickness. But surely, on the principle of mortifying the flesh, periods of plague and sickness should be the very occasions for increasing the severity of abstinence. In old times they were. If the enfeebling of the body is the point aimed at, surely the feebler it is the better. The old saints would have fasted harder than ever at such times. The new principle vitiates the old and admits that a weak and feeble body is less, and not more, able to stand moral strain and win spiritual victories. That is, in fact, the true principle, that to keep the body fit is the right way to advance the interest of the soul. And the proper sort of fasting and abstinence must be conducted on those lines. Due attention to the laws of health, to cleanliness and sanitation, fresh air and exercise, all notoriously neglected by the old school of ascetics, must be regarded as pious duties. Holy men of ancient days advanced their reputation for sanctity by cultivating vermin and never changing their shirts. Those moderns who are desirous of winning a similar reputation should reverse the process. We still have scope enough, and there is even room for the clergy to set the example. Clean persons and pure linen, neat apparel and the unsparing employment of the razor and the comb, might well be more conspicuous Lenten tokens than they are. Practical self-denial might find a

higher place, too, in our pious exercises, the active promotion of some local good object, or of some work of general usefulness, as home or foreign missions. Not forgetting, also, particular attention paid to any known personal fault or failing, duly marking any steps of progress, or the reverse. None of these things are as prominent as they ought to be in the list of Lenten observances ; they might very well play a larger part in up-to-date methods of fasting and abstinence.

PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY.

THREE years ago the Chairman of this Company said, "The Company really has attained to national importance." This was true ; but while at the end of the year 1891 the total funds of the Company amounted to £14,586,918, at the end of the year just closed they amounted to £21,174,624, an increase of just 50 per cent. in three years. It is not too much to say that no institution in existence is so bound up with the life of the nation. The sorrows of the country are faithfully reflected at Holborn Bars, and effective aid is rendered by the Prudential in the day of national calamity. Never a wreck, an explosion, a pit accident, or any other catastrophe of any importance, that does not find its special record in the books of this Company. The office also deals in a truly paternal manner with its working-class policy-holders in times of commercial strikes and depression.

Full information regarding the progress and history of the Company during the past year will be found in the balance-sheet which we give elsewhere. The annual valuation submitted by the actuary shows the surplus for 1894 to be £532,186 (including £100,000 brought forward) in the Ordinary department ; and £793,861 (including £360,000 brought forward) in the Industrial department. This total of £1,326,047 compares with £943,000 for the previous year. The Prudential pays a very handsome bonus to its policy-holders, and, with the continuance of results like the above, there is no fear of its showing a decrease.

Lastly, we would draw attention to its sound investments. With funds of over £21,000,000 to deal with, this branch of business assumes the highest importance. A special supplement is issued, giving a list of the investments in detail, and we venture to say that a bettor disposal of trust funds could not be made. The Prudential, unlike other offices in this matter, courts publicity, and gives a detailed statement of its stocks, shares, and mortgages. More than this cannot be asked for, as the office, by the fulness of the information it affords, gives the public every facility for arriving at a fair estimate of its position.

THE Venerable Chauncy Maples, Archdeacon of Nyasaland, who joined the Universities' Mission in 1876, has accepted the Bishopric of Nyasaland, vacant through the resignation of Dr. Hornby.

THE late Rev. G. W. Herbert is to be succeeded at St Peter's, Vauxhall, by the Rev. A. R. Sharpe. Mr. Sharpe was formerly an Assistant Curate at St. Peter's, and has for some time been working at St. Clement's Church in Philadelphia.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE influenza has attacked numerous Church dignitaries, as well as hosts of the parochial clergy, during the last week or two. Lately we heard of the death of the venerable Dean of Ripon, Dr. Fremantel. Canon Knox Little, who caught the disease at Mentone, has had a narrow escape, but he is believed to be now out of danger. One of the saddest cases reported is that of Prebendary Venables of Lincoln and his wife, who died within one day of each other. The Dean of Westminster and Canon Scott-Holland, who have been among the victims, are now, we are glad to hear, almost well.

The vacated deanery of Ripon is valued at £1,000 a year. It was held by the late incumbent for nineteen years. This is the fourth deanery which has fallen vacant since Lord Rosebery assumed the premiership, the others being Hereford, Durham, and Winchester.

The epidemic and the severe weather have had a most prejudicial effect upon school attendance, and the managers of the poorer Church schools are naturally in some anxiety as to the result in the diminution of the grants. It is satisfactory, therefore, to learn that Mr. Acland has instructed the Inspectors to be considerate in the matter, and to make reasonable allowances. This is only fair, but fairness has not always characterised the orders issued from Whitehall.

The report of the London Diocesan Board of Education observes that the Education Department has become more reasonable, both in the extent and urgency of its requirements, but school managers, in certain districts, have been called upon to face another and a greater difficulty and danger. Some of the vestries and local boards have forced such costly and peremptory demands upon Church schools that several of them must have been given up but for the prompt assistance given by the Diocesan Board and other Church organisations. The Executive Committee appealed to the Education Department for some protection against the action of these local bodies, and suggested that where the requirements of the Department in regard to sanitary and other improvements have been satisfied, school managers should be exempted, for some time at least, from further demands. They certainly ought to be.

The report calls attention to the excellent work done in Kensington by the Church Education Board, pointing out that the system of federating the schools which has been adopted in that rural deanery ought to be followed elsewhere. Eight out of the thirteen schools in the deanery have federated themselves under the Kensington Board, with the result that they have increased in efficiency and been able to meet the requirements of the Education Department. The Lady Mary Glyn Fund, which was started for the purpose of helping the Church schools in the deanery, realised during the year £424. 4s. 9d.

The ignorance on religious subjects in which the scholars in some Church schools are permitted to grow up is shameful and shocking. "Peter Lombard" gives us some terrible instances this week, for the authenticity of which he can vouch, as he received them from the examiner himself. The pupils, some of whose handwriting is said to be so good as to indicate that they are not very young, had not the ghost of an idea of the religious meaning of Shrove Tuesday, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, or Easter Day. The

only good they could see in Good Friday was in its connection with hot cross buns, just as Shrove Tuesday was only celebrated for pancakes. About the latter one youngster wrote :—"Many people eat too many, and make themselves ill, which makes them wish that they had not eaten any."

Here is an account of the origin of the Catholic Church and of the Reformation, which would almost startle Lord Rosebery ; it is written by a boy who is a member of a Church choir, and whose father is superintendent of the Sunday School :—"The Catholic Church was established by Henry VIII., who started the Reformation against the Church of Rome. Henry did not really wish for a Reformation, but only started it to frighten the Pope, with whom he had quarrelled"

Some good advice as to Lenten fasting is given by the Archbishop of York in his Diocesan Magazine. He oberves that there is little to say as to the duty of abstinence. "This is, of course, our bounden duty in loyal obedience to the Book of Common Prayer ; and whatever form it may take, it should involve some genuine self-denial. But the Church leaves us free both as regards the matter and the manner of fasting." Dr. Maclagan suggests giving up smoking, either in whole or in part, as a suitable discipline for Lent ; and he adds that there is one form of abstinence of quite another kind which may well be practised at this season. Christian people may at least leave off finding fault with their brethren. Whether certain "religious" newspapers would survive the forty days if they followed the Archbishop's advice may perhaps be doubted.

Canon Body is preaching a course of Lent sermons at Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, on Tuesdays, at 12.

The vicarage of Sheffield has been offered to Canon Eyre, of Tiverton. The *Record* says says it would be an admirable appointment, if Canon Eyre can see his way to go.

Missionary work in China does not seem to be seriously interfered with by the war. Bishop Scott has written home for the two ladies who were to have gone out to him last October, but who were left behind in consequence of the war. The Bishop now thinks that there is no reason why they should not come out and begin work. Nurse Sands, of the Infirmary, Chester, and Miss Mabel Wollaston, of St. Denys' Home, Warminster, sailed on February 28th for Tientsin.

The Archbishop of Dublin is making another appeal on behalf of the Spanish Reformers whom he has just provided with a bishop. The Endowment Fund for the Reformed Churches of Spain and Portugal still needs about £3,000. The Reformers themselves have done well, but they can hardly do more, and Irish Churchmen have already contributed over £1,200. Lord Plunket looks, therefore, to friends in England to make up the deficit.

A number of English Churchmen have presented an address to the Archbishop, thanking him for the consecration of Senor Cabrera. Some of his opponents, on the other hand, appear to be losing their heads more hopelessly than ever. The *Church Times*, for example, has gone so far as to talk about cutting off the Church of Ireland from the Anglican Communion for the sake of Lord Plunket's action. It said last week, "It may be necessary for English Bishops, not by individual and ill-considered action, but after serious deliberation, to do for Ireland what Archbishop Plunket has so rashly and mischievously attempted to do for Spain." That is, to commit what would be beyond question an act of schism of the most flagrant sort. Granting that much may be said against what the Archbishop of Dublin has done, why cannot his critics leave judgment upon him to the Pan-Anglican Synod, which will meet two years hence, and will be able to consider the question in cool blood?

There is a growing feeling, according to the American correspondent of the *Rock*, in favour of connecting the Primacy of the American Church with the national capital, the city of Washington. At present the senior bishop is, by virtue of his seniority, the presiding bishop. The diocese of Maryland is on the eve of division, when a new diocese will be created, with Washington as its centre. The plan suggested is that the Washington Diocese should cede to the House of Bishops the choice of the Diocesan, or that some change should be made in the constitution and canons which would provide for the election of the Bishop of Washington by the House of Bishops. We do not see why the American Church should not follow the example of Canada, and appoint at least one Metropolitan, with the title of Archbishop.

We have received an appeal on behalf of the mission church of the Good Shepherd, in the parish of St. John's, Walham Green. The curate-in-charge, the Rev. H. J. Moore Sanders, writes :—"I venture to appeal to you to aid me in raising £200, to buy an iron church. The district is a very poor one. The people among whom I work are almost wholly the poorest of the poor. For years past they have been without any place of worship. Last October I opened a room in the Mission House as a chapel, and have held services on Sundays, and children's services on Tuesdays. During the time that has elapsed since the opening the people have shown their appreciation by crowding it."

THE MAKING OF MIND.

THE Rev. Prebendary J. W. Reynolds, in his Scientific Address on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of Sts. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street (near the General Post Office), stated :—

The Human Mind is not intellect only ; it partakes of emotion, with consciousness of right and wrong. As mere intellect, it possesses three fundamental powers—discrimination, by which we know of differences ; similarity, which tells of agreement or likeness ; memory, that by which we acquire and retain. These are intellect, the whole, and nothing but the intellect.

No man is wholly dull, nor is any one perfect. The dull may be brightened ; the insane may be rendered more normal by material and dietary processes ; we may all become more powerful and accurate by well-directed discipline. Religious training raises the moral standard, beautifies the conscience, and gives the highest pitch of knowledge and joy in the sense of nearness to God.

More than the physical goes to the making of mind. It is force of a nobler sort than the mechanical. It is a higher life-power than that by which lower animals live. In our months of life earlier than our day of birth, we are in form like some lower creatures, but not of them. It is no more a fact that we are evoluted from the beast than that the rainbow is evolved from a soap-bubble. Every advance in organisms is in company with a more complex structure of brain. The

inner and outer processes are in relation to enlarging external circumstances, and co-ordained by a purpose embracing more than the small hypothesis of sexual and natural selection. The connection is not so much in lineage of parental generation, but on bases moulded by general and particular formative power, acting geologically and teleologically for the production of man, man being the completion toward which all earthly life has advanced.

The discovery of what Professor Flethery calls "intellectual centres," not possessed by any animal lower than man—certainly not to the same extent—may be considered as indications of future advance, not by animal means, but by a throwing around of light that heralds a splendid day.

THE long spell of severe weather has reduced church attendances everywhere. The vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, referring to the subject in his parish magazine for March, says that even the vigorous and healthy may not unnaturally find excuses for not attending the early services, while for aged persons, and for those who are more or less delicate, it might be even dangerous to health. Mr. Kitto is not surprised, therefore, to find that while attendance at all the services has been greatly reduced, the number at the early Communion at 8.30 a.m. has suffered most.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Returning from the Captivity. Read Ezra i. 1-11. Introduction.—The Lord our God is full of mercy, long-suffering, and love. He will not always chide. Although He hates and punishes sin, as He did in His own chosen people, He is ready and willing to receive the penitent, and He alone is able to turn sorrow into joy. He delights to welcome back all who have thought in their hearts they could do without the Divine leading. Throughout all the history of God's chosen people we see this demonstrated in a very remarkable manner. We cannot go alone, we shall soon fall, soon be defeated. Ah, brethren, God is able to keep us from falling and perishing.

> Meantime, along the narrow, rugged path
> Thyself hast trod,
> Lead, Saviour, lead me home in childlike faith,
> Home to my God,
> To rest for ever, after earthly strife,
> In the calm light of everlasting life.

How many have launched their bark on the ocean of this life without any pilot, without the unerring chart, and multitudes have made sad shipwreck and foundered on the rocks of despair. Alas, many forget—

> When storms of fierce temptation beat,
> And furious foes assail,
> My refuge is the mercy-seat,
> My hope within the veil.
>
> From strife of tongues and bitter words
> My spirit flies to Thee;
> Joy of my heart, the thought affords,
> My Saviour died for me.

We may draw a few practical lessons from this subject:—1. The Lord will receive the repentant and sorrowful. 2. The Lord will forgive the transgressions of His people. 3. The Lord will have compassion and give joy. 4. The Lord will give us freedom from the captivity of sin. 5. The Lord will turn our mourning into thanksgiving and gladness. 6. The Lord will lead His people in pleasant places. "Look unto Me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth."—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

SIR,—Is it not safer to appeal to Scripture, and not to what "some say" or "others say"? If we "date the Christian Church from our Lord's commission . . . . or from the coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost," . . . . what have we to say of all that blessed company of saints who entered into rest before the Saviour's coming in the flesh? Does Mr. Lawrence see this dilemma?

I submit that we ought to understand by the expression "the Church," in its strictest sense, the whole body of the redeemed. In this sense the Church consists of two parts—the "Church Triumphant" and the "Church Militant." I need not say that the Church Triumphant are they that have fought and won, while the Church Militant are they that are still fighting under their great Leader.

Mr. Lawrence's quotation fits well into this view of the Church: "Upon this rock I will build my Church." The Lord Jesus is the great Builder. Cf. St. Paul: "Ye are God's building." The Lord Jesus is Himself the Foundation: "Other foundation can no man lay." On Himself, as a stone in the building, He lays every true Christian who can make Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This is easy and clear.

But not so that the baptismal rite gives admission *per se* to this Church. It may give admission to a congregation, or even to what is called a Church. If Mr. Lawrence would understand by baptism what ought to be understood by it, then there might be some truth in the argument. How many baptised persons are there whose lives are worse than heathen? Are these members of the Church of Christ?

Mr. Lawrence's quotation in answer to my second question is rather unfortunate for his view (Acts ii. 41): "Then they that gladly received His word were baptised." If this be properly explained, it means, not that they were admitted by baptism into the Church, but they were admitted into the Church and then baptised. Perhaps it were better said, they were considered fit, because of receiving the word, to be of the Church, and so were baptised. What will Mr. Lawrence make of Simon Magus?

If I remarked on Mr. Lawrence's reference to politeness, etc., I might be tempted to use a *tu quoque;* but I will only say I had no wish to do otherwise than deal honestly with what he wrote. And yet I should like to say further that "millions say" is no argument, because they that enter the "narrow way" are only "few."

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage,
March 9th, 1895.

ST. JAMES' DISUSED CHURCHYARD, PENTONVILLE ROAD.

SIR,—I have just had a very important letter from the Earl of Meath, K.P., of 83, Lancaster-gate, W., Metropolitan Public Gardens Association, again re-

iterating their old repeated offers to lay out and take over. and maintain this old closed-up churchyard. But would you believe it, sir, the chief obstacle and opposition comes from the ill-advised, pig-headed, factious hindrances of the old, but sturdy Vicar, the Rev. Dr. Stubbs, locally called—for what reason I cannot divine—"Holy Joe Stubbs." Now it appears there are ample powers under the London Open Spaces Act, if Mr. Stubbs will give his consent; but he won't. Now, by a very sensible, but very obscure, clause in the Acts for closing up London churchyards, 1850 55, and the continuing Acts amending the same, one of the strict obligations cast upon the vicar, wardens, and vestry and parishes of churchyards so closed up is, "That they shall for ever afterwards keep up, maintain in decent and orderly state and fashion, such disused churchyards." Now in this case this has never been done, but the ground has been a scandal and disgrace, and a menace to the health of the parish—a very, veritable refuse hole for old dead dogs and cats, human excreta, old broken bottles, pots, kettles, and pans, etc., and the rank grasses and broken-down vaults and tombstones.

May I beg you will raise your powerful pen and voice and plead with this old-fashioned world-idea Vicar to remove his factious barrier to what would be, if carried out, a great London and local sanitary reform and improvement, and a health-lung to this poor and densely overcrowded artisan parish.

WILLIAM MORLEY.

92, Richmond-road, Barnsbury-park N.,
February 26th, 1895.

DR. MARTINEAU AND THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

SIR,—In a letter to the *Times* not very long ago, Dr. Martineau, referring to the Sermon on the Mount, spoke of "Christ's method of opening his commission to the poor peasants of Galilee." Now, on turning to my Bible, I read: "There followed Him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from *Jerusalem*, and from *Judæa*. and from beyond Jordan" (Matt. iv. 25). How can a multitude from Judæa and Jerusalem be correctly described as "poor peasants of Galilee"? Moreover, Dr. Selah Merrill says: "If we go east of the Jordan into Peræa and the Decapolis, we find a country that, in former times, was more thickly dotted with cities and towns than any other portion of Syria of equal size, or any other section of the globe" ("Galilee in the time of Christ," p. 68). How, again, can these townspeople be properly described as poor peasants of Galilee? One cannot but recall Dr. Routh's wise advice to Dean Burgon in his student days: "Verify your references." Dr. Martineau also declares that the Sermon on the Mount is "absolutely without any trace of the doctrine of the Atonement by the blood of Christ." On the contrary, I venture to affirm that this doctrine of the Atonement underlies the whole of the Sermon on the Mount. In the very forefront occurs this saying of the Divine Teacher: "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. v. 17). Now the Jews received the Law under the Levitical priesthood, and the priesthood implied sacrifice (Heb vii. 11, 12; viii. 2). "Every unprejudiced reader of the Bible," says Dr. Edersheim, "must feel that sacrifices constitute the centre of the Old Testament." "The fundamental idea of sacrifice in the Old Testament is that of substitution, which again seems to imply everything else—atonement and redemption, vicarious punishment and forgiveness" ("The Temple," pp. 80, 81). It is clear, then, that Christ could not claim to fulfil the Law without offering a sacrifice, which implied atonement. And how could our Lord declare that He came to fulfil the prophets without assuming the character of that great Central Figure of Prophecy, the righteous but suffering servant of Jehovah delineated in chap. liii. of Isaiah, the prophet "who was great and faithful in his vision" (Ecclus. xlviii. 22; see also Matt. iv. 14; viii. 17). If "the ultimate dramatic unity of prophecy is alone supplied by Christ," then "He was wounded for our trangressions and bruised for our iniquities; by His stripes all we, who, like sheep, have gone astray, are healed; because the Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us" (Isa. liii. 5, 6). What does this 17th verse of the Sermon on the Mount implicitly import if not that which Hebrews xi. explicitly declares: "Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come . . . . neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. . . . . Now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. ix. 11, 12, 26). And this is in perfect agreement with the rest of St. Matthew's Gospel, which, being the earliest of all the four Gospels (as even the sceptical writers, Baur and Strauss, admit), and, indeed, clearly belonging to the epoch of the destruction of Jerusalem, is a valuable commentary on the Sermon on the Mount as understood by the original hearers. In Matt. i. Christ is coming "to save His people from their sins"; in ch. ii. the offering of myrrh "His sepulchre foreshows." Our Lord foretells His death on four separate occasions (Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 22; xx. 17; xxvi. 1, 2). He also declares that "The Son of Man is come to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28); and at the Last Supper, in handing the cup to His disciples, He said, "This is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28). Moreover, the account of the Crucifixion (Matt. xxvii.) shows that Isa. liii. was not absent from the mind of the writer.

There can be no doubt then that St. Matthew, at any rate, did not agree with Dr. Martineau that the Sermon on the Mount is without any trace of the Atonement by the blood of Christ." It is in virtue of the Atonement which our Saviour has made "through the blood of His cross" (Col. i. 20) that we have access to God, and with humble confidence, using the Lord's Prayer, may call Him "our Father."

It seems very necessary in these days to bear in mind St. Paul's instruction, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess. v. 21).

H. HEBER EVANS.

March 1st, 1895.

THE *Church Review* says that the Rev. A. B. Sharpe has been preferred to the vicarage of St. Peter's, Vauxhall. Mr. Sharpe was formerly one of the assistant priests at this Church, but has for some time been working at the Church of St. Clement's, Philadelphia, so long associated with the labours of the Cowley Fathers in Boston.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Awdry, Rev. Vere, M.A., Vicar of Broad Hinton, Wilts; Vicar of Ampfield, otherwise Ansfield.

Barmby, Rev. James, D.D., Vicar of Northallerton; Rural Dean of Northallerton.

Bellamy, Rev. James, D.D., President of St. John's College, Oxford; Rector of Lekeford, otherwise Leckford.

Blockley, Rev. Thomas Trotter, M.A., Curate of St. Albans; Secretary of the National Society for St. Albans Deanery.

Bramley, Rev. Henry Ramsden, M.A., Resident Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln, and Prebendary of Bedford Major; Precentor and Canon Residentiary of Lincoln Cathedral.

Broughton, Rev. Frederic Robert, M.A., Rector of Wyddial; Secretary of the National Society for Bennington and Buntingford Deaneries.

Carlyon, Rev. Hubert Edward, B.A., Vicar of Harlesden; Secretary of the National Society for Harrow Deanery.

Chesters, Rev. Leonard Morris, M.A., Curate of Beamish, Durham; Rector of Knapton, Norfolk.

Clark, Rev. James Curtis, B.A., Curate of Heaton, Bradford; Vicar of Bankfoot, Bradford.

Collier, Rev. Charles, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Dinting Vale, Derbyshire.

Deedes, Rev. Arthur Gordon, D.D., Curate of St. John-the-Divine, Kennington; Secretary of the National Society for Kennington Deanery.

Druce, Rev. Arthur John, M.A., Cuckfield; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester.

Eales, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Edale, Derbyshire; Vicar of Unsworth, near Manchester.

Evans, Rev. John Silas, B.A., Curate of Rhosddu, Wrexham; Vicar Choral of St. Asaph Cathedral.

Evered, Rev. Ranulph Hamilton, M.A., Precentor of Gloucester Cathedral; Vicar of Newland, Gloucestershire.

Eyre, Rev. John Rashdall, M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, Tiverton, Devon, and Honorary Canon of Liverpool; Vicar of Sheffield,

Gaussen, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Chaplain of Liverpool Seamen's Orphanage; Vicar of St. Mary's, Brighton.

Geldart, Rev. Henry; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester.

Grylls, Rev. Francis Vivian Friend Glynn, B.A., Vicar of Sheldon; Secretary of the National Society for Dunkeswell and Honiton Deanery.

Gwyon, Rev. John, Curate of Chesterton, Staffordshire; Rector of Bisleigh, otherwise Bisley, Woking.

Hillyard, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Rector of Stoodleigh; Rural Dean of Tiverton West.

Hine-Haycock, Rev. Trevitt Reginald, Deputy Minor Canon of Westminster, and Curate of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields; Minor Canon of Westminster.

Hordern, Rev. Hugh Maudslay, B.A., Curate of Warnham Horsham; Rector of Singleton.

Howell, Rev. Elias Philip, M.A., Master of Bottwnog Intermediate School; Rector of Pentraeth with-Llanbedrgoch, Anglesey.

Hughes, Rev. Arthur Edgar, B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.

Jackson, Rev. Edward Harley Molineux, Curate-in-Charge of Holy Trinity, Wandsworth; Secretary of the National Society for Streatham Deanery.

Jukes, Rev. Richard Starr, Rector of Milton-next-Gravesend; Rector of Merston.

Julian, Rev. Francis Lewis, Brighton; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester.

Keeling, Rev. Charles Nevill, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Collyhurst; Honorary Canon in Manchester Cathedral.

Kitson, Rev. Edward Bredin Blake, M.A., Vicar of Northaw; Secretary of the National Society for Barnet Deanery.

Littlewood, Rev. John, M.A., Frampton Mansell, Stroud; Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.

Madden, Rev. George Charles Brownlow, M.A.; Vicar of Armitage Bridge; Secretary of the National Society for Huddersfield Deanery.

Maxwell, Rev Gerald Speirs, M.A., Curate of Wantage; Sub-Warden of the Community of St, Mary the Virgin, and Chaplain of St. Mary's Home, Wantage.

Merrikin, Rev. Matthew, A.M., Vicar of Great Wilbraham; Vicar of Kelstern-with-Calcethorpe, Louth.

Nash, Rev. James Okey, B.A.; Vicar of Radley, Berks.

Ottley, Rev. Herbert Taylor, M.A., Chaplain on the Bengal Ecclesiastical Establishment; Chaplain at Kasauli, Punjab.

Palmes, Rev. Prebendary Arthur Lindsay, Vicar of Dover; Rural Dean of Dover.

Pereira, Rev. Henry Horace, M.A., Vicar of Croydon; Rural Dean of Croydon.

Pritchard, Rev. Thomas John, B.A., Jarvis Brook, Crowborough; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester.

Roberts, Rev. Francis Barry, M.A., Curate of Worthenbury, Wrexham; Vicar of Bettisfield, Flint.

Rose, Rev. William, Curate of Eastrington; to the Ecclesiastical District of St. Stephen, Newport, Brough.

Rotton, Rev. Charles John Stuart, M.A., Rector of Hope Mansel; Secretary of the National Society for Ross Deanery.

Rowsell, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Beccles, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon in Norwich Cathedral.

St. John, Rev. John Seymour, B.A., Curate of St. Thomas's, Stamford-hill; Secretary of the National Society for Hackney Deanery.

Sanders, Rev. Montague Charles, M.A., Chaplain H.M. Indian Government; Chaplain at Karachi.

Sandford, Rev. H. E., M.A., Rector of Killylea; Incumbent of Drogheda.

Scott, Rev. Alexander, Nairne, M.A., Vicar of Newland-with-Redbrook, Gloucestershire; Vicar of Stratton St. Margaret's, Wilts.

Sharpe, Rev. Alfred Bowyer, M.A., Assistant-Minister of St. Clement's, Philadelphia; Vicar of St. Peter's, Vauxhall.

Sibthorp, Rev. Henry James, M.A., Curate of St. Edmund's, Northampton; Vicar of Eye.

Simkin, Rev. Robert Lingard, Curate of Dymock; Vicar of Oakridge, Gloucestershire.

Smith, Rev. Barnard Gooch, M.A., Rector of Thurlton, Norfolk; Rector of Thorpe-next-Haddiscoe, Norfolk.

Stephenson, Rev. Henry Major, M.A., Rector of Toft, Cambridge; Rector of Kegworth.

Thomas, Rev. Arthur Nutter, M.A., Resident Chaplain to the Archbishop of York.

Tollinton, Rev. Richard Bartram, late Resident Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon, and Chaplain of the Liverpool Seamen's Orphan Institution.

Tyacke, Rev. Canon Joseph Sidney, M.A., Vicar of Helston; Rural Dean of Kirrier.

Wordsworth, Rev. John, Vicar of Gosforth; Vicar of All Hallows', Carlisle.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Atkins, Rev. Richard White, Rector of Romansleigh, N. Devon, on the 10th inst., aged 64.

Boase, Rev. Charles William, M.A., Senior Fellow of his College, and late Reader in Foreign History, at Exeter College, Oxford, on the 11th inst., aged 66.

Chandos-Pole, Rev. William, at Radborne Rectory, on the 3rd inst., aged 61.

Fremantle, Very Rev. W. R., D.D., Dean of Ripon, at Wimbledon, on the 8th inst., aged 87.

Julius, Rev. A. E., for forty years Rector of the Parish, at Southery Rectory, Norfolk, on the 4th inst., aged 76.

Morse, Rev. Thomas Daniel Cox, LL.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Newgate-street, E.C., at the Vicarage, on the 11th inst., aged 70.

Rust, Rev. Cyprian Thomas, formerly Rector of Heigham, Norwich, and Westerfield, Ipswich, at Soham Vicarage, on the 7th inst., aged 86.

Venables, Rev. Edmund, Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Lincoln Cathedral., at the Precentory, Lincoln, on the 5th inst., aged 75; and on the 6th inst., Caroline Mary, his Wife, aged 70.

Whately, Rev. Charles, late Rector of Taplow, at Berkeley House, Reading, on the 5th inst., aged 79.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CLASSES AND THE MASSES.

By the Rev. A. F W. INGRAM, Head of the Oxford House, Bethnal-green.

Preached in All Saints' Church, Margaret-street, on December 14th, at Noon, being one of a Series of Addresses in connection with the Christian Social Union.

THE subject I would bring to your notice this morning is the meaning that underlies the phrase "the classes and the masses." To come straight to the point, the sting of it is this that, somehow in our civilisation, we have violated God's idea of society. God's intention, if I may express an opinion, was not a state where all should be precisely level and equal, but a society where every man as he had received the gift ministered the same to others. As it is, one half of society is drawn together in one part of the town; while the other half, consisting almost entirely of the poorest, are herded together in the other part. That is the evil, and my object is to show you the effect of this as it has come under my observation during six years spent in Bethnal-green, and particularly during a ten days' mission concluded only a few days ago in Hackney-wick among ten thousand of the very poor.

The first thing that strikes one forcibly is the ceaseless competition, the perpetual undercutting of one another day after day and week after week. Close to the Oxford House, and within forty yards of each other, are two cabinet-makers' shops. In one, three young boys are working day and night to try and keep together the custom of the shop which their father, who is very ill, had when he was able to work. In the other is a young cabinet-maker, who is carrying on a most gallant fight to keep his mother and sisters; and for five years he has maintained this struggle with an independence that does him credit, and restores one's belief in human nature. But what a struggle! Even at nineteen his brow is furrowed with care, anxiety, and ceaseless worry.

Again, we hold a ten days' mission; and what is our difficulty? Why, that one can with difficulty arrange an hour late enough or early enough for people to come. The evening service is announced for half-past eight, and they arrive about nine; or if one wishes to get them to attend Holy Communion before work, it is necessary to get up at five o'clock. Such are the hours in the district. Besides this, in consequence of competition, hundreds are out of work; and yet others are working twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours a day. What is the result of all this? What can one expect but mutual suspicion? It is difficult to talk of brotherhood, when every moment you are trying to cut another man out of the market by doing a thing a halfpenny cheaper! Why, in some parts of Bethnal-green it is almost a point of honour not to know a next-door neighbour; and there are some who do not even know the names of their own lodgers. During the late mission, a butcher, at the risk of ruin, agreed to give up Sunday trading! we went round to the other butchers in the district to try to induce them to do the same; but the mutual suspicion it brought to light was remarkable; and the difficulties that beset one in endeavouring to start such a co-operative movement are tremendous.

The next thing that strikes one forcibly is the disorganisation of labour. The classes make a fatal mistake when they sneer at or discourage trade unionism. What is wanted to stop strikes is that all trades should be completely organised; and not the men only but the masters too. Then there will be little difficulty in both sides coming to terms. But what happens to those who are left stranded by the better organisation of labour? What happens to the weak, the decrepit, the unskilled? They die about in Bethnal-green, Shoreditch, Whitechapel, and such-like districts. But there is the workhouse, you say. Surely you can sympathise with that indomitable spirit in our race which would rather die independent than live a pauper.

Another result of the division of the classes and the masses is the over-crowding of the latter. Even in that quiet, respectable-looking street in which the Oxford House is built there are often to be found four families living in one house; and if you had accompanied me yesterday to another street you would have passed up a rickety staircase, where the bannisters are broken half-way up, and entered a room on the top floor to find lying on a rough bed a boy suffering agonies from heart disease. In this one room live a mother, two sisters, and another brother; the boys sleeping on one bed, and the girl and mother on the other. But how do they live? How do they make both ends meet? The mother will earn a shilling next day after standing at the wash-tub from six in the morning till half-past nine at night. The little girl gets two shillings a week for turning some sort of wheel, and she is only fourteen years of age. We go on to our next house, and there lives a blind boy aged nineteen who, although blind, is a splendid gymnast, and is engaged to look after oranges down by the dock, for which he gets 2s. a-week. He lives with his mother, who gives up the bed to him, and herself sleeps on the floor. It is all very well to say that these people do not care. They do care; but are

obliged to put up with it. A favourite saying with them is, "Well, a rat in a hole is better than a rat out of a hole, anyhow." Could an expression be more pathetic?

Then there is class bitterness. Can you wonder at it? If you lived in such surroundings as those described, and then came up in the season to Hyde-park, and saw money apparently flung here and there without regard—poured out like water upon mere amusement—would you not feel bitter in regard to those who, so long as there is no revolution, are willing to let things drift? Of course, the masses are familiar with the names of such men as Lord Shaftesbury and of Lord Meath; but their fundamental idea of the classes is that they are determined not to help unless forced to do so.

It is scarcely necessary to mention the tyranny of the drink traffic. The evil is daily before us in the ruin it brings upon the home; children being made motherless or fatherless; and husband or wife desolate. But ameliorate the conditions under which they live, and much of the craving will disappear. We all know the story of the philanthropist who, in remonstrating with a man about drink, received the answer, "You come and live down our court, sir, and you would soon be glad of a drink."

Then come early marriages. If a boy has dropped out of your circle of clubs or classes—and among a group of five or six hundred this is not at first recognised—you are almost certain to find that he has married some girl of seventeen or eighteen, and is bringing up, amidst poverty and disease, puny, unhealthy children, which are a disgrace to civilisation.

Lastly, we notice paganism. The amount of paganism amongst the masses is deplorable. Large numbers have never uttered a prayer for ten or twenty years; and among the hundreds of men who stand round me in Victoria-park on Sunday afternoons in the summer, I know perfectly well that not one in ten ever enter any place of worship. Paganism! Why, experience in the Black Country and in the Potteries prepared me for something; but it did not prepare me for what I found in East London. It is not so much disbelief, not so much atheism, as an apparent indifference to all religion.

And now to roughly sketch in some degree a remedy for such a state of things as I have been describing. It is perfectly obvious that the evil must be faced. It is suicidal; it is un-Christian to ignore it. It is suicidal because if anarchism and atheism are not yet full blown growths, this is the soil in which to develop them. If we do not want a revolution—I am talking to you now simply as citizens—if we do not want a revolution we must cease shutting our eyes to these social problems. But in speaking to you as Christians, and I presume by far the majority here present are Christians, is it not intolerable to talk of brotherhood, to talk of self-sacrifice, and to assure Christ in our hymns

> Were the whole realm of nature mine
> That were an offering far too small,

and yet to have done no more for those who are brothers and sisters than has been done? Can we wonder that the poor regard the classes as hypocrites; and their brotherhood and self-sacrifice as pure sham; and those who go to church as the most un-Christian in their conduct?

In the few remaining minutes let me sketch what has already been achieved or attempted by the classes on behalf of those in the East-end. It was ten years ago that in the midst of her colleges, her education, her refinement, Oxford heard the bitter cry of outcast London. Since then has sprung up Toynbee Hall in Whitechapel, and the Oxford House in Bethnal-green, and not only the Oxford House, but a number of public school and college missions have been started, all doing good work, and all proving that the classes have in some measure recognised their responsibilities. But I must, of course, confine my remarks to what has been done at the Oxford House, for naturally I am most familiar with the work accomplished by it. And, first of all, let me say that this work has been wonderfully blessed by God. Much of the service rendered has been unpaid, and has been carried on by laymen, a fact which goes far to prove to these people that Christianity is not the *peculium* of the clergy. There are, undoubtedly, many hard-working and devoted men among parochial clergy in the East-end of London. But the classes are sadly mistaken if they think they have done their duty in helping to maintain a staff of overworked clergy. It will lead to the Church being looked on as a moral police force to prevent the outburst of a revolution. What is wanted is personal action, personal self-sacrifice, personal sympathy from the laymen of the better classes. It is impossible to fully estimate the good that has been done, and can be done, by these workers. The mere fact that a number of devoted men, highly educated both physically and intellectually, attend chapel at eight o'clock in the morning, go to church on Sunday, walk through the streets during a mission and sing in procession, in order to attract people into the church, has an extraordinary influence in making the young men of the district realise that Christianity is a living reality, and not a mere pastime for sweethearts and wives and perhaps for themselves when they come to be as old as their grandfathers.

What does a Settlement do? It first of all backs up the existing organisations in the district. A teacher if needed is supplied to the Sunday-schools. Visitors are sent to look after the sick in hospitals or in their own homes. Help can be given to the Charity Organisation Society, or the Mansion House Council on the Dwellings of the Poor, and so on. But how can a Settlement deal with the

various evils I have brought before you? How can we deal with this ceaseless competition, for instance? How can we deal with the terrible monotony of life? Well, not at all adequately; but what could be done has been done. Comfortable club-rooms have been provided where women, children, and girls can come and spend their evenings amid bright surroundings and in good company. There are clubs for all grades; indeed, in one the members almost all belong to the criminal class. The fact that we have hundreds coming to these various clubs is sufficient proof that they can be made efficient counter attractions to the public-house. In spite of the fact that no intoxicating drink of any kind is sold large numbers pour into them every night.

Obviously these Settlements tend to allay mutual suspicion. When men and women meet night after night, belong to the same co-operative stores, attend concerts and dramatic performances, it is impossible for mutual suspicion and jealousy to be maintained. Then for the very poor, for the stragglers in the labour army, for those who have "gone under" a shelter has been provided, and a helping hand held out. As to overcrowding untold good can be done by workers in these Settlements on behalf of sanitary reform. They can shield lodgers from the consequences of making a complaint, by themselves making the complaint to the vestry. Much friction can be avoided, and a great good done by helping to investigate cases for the public authority of the district.

These Settlements are also instrumental in dispelling the class bitterness between rich and poor. As to the drink traffic, nothing is a better testimonial of our work than that it has had the effect of decreasing the public-house trade, and makes the publican consider the advisability of moving further off.

Turning to the subject of early marriages, I know, as one who ties the knot of our club members, that where they used to ask to be married when about eighteen or nineteen, they now never think of marrying before they are twenty-five or twenty-six, and can start housekeeping with a little money.

The paganism that exists has grown up in consequence of the neglect of the years that have passed. But the energies put forth by these Settlements tend to dispel it. Through our clubs and meetings we endeavour to draw the members, one by one, to attend a short Sunday service, and from thence to be led, we hope, to the altar of the parish church.

But after all these efforts are only pioneer. They are nothing to what will take place in future. We can, however, say this: our work has gone home to the hearts of those whose hard conditions it has been our endeavour to ameliorate. Our work covers the life of the family; clubs have been provided not only for the working-man, but for the children, the girls, and the wives. Then, such work as this gives scope to all political parties, even though they hold totally diverse views on political questions. We are equally supported by the Radical party and the Conservative party. The Christian Social Union is no political organisation. It is a union of those, whether Conservatives or Radicals, who feel the existence of a social question, and desire to do their best to solve it. And they cannot do better than give personal service, either by living in the neighbourhood for a longer or shorter period, or by coming down to open debates, etc. But there is also a financial side. This work involves considerable outlay, though the workers, many of them, give their services for nothing, or practically nothing. It is a duty, then, that devolves upon the classes to help support these Settlements. But something more than money is necessary. We want your sympathy—your hearts.

> As one who stands upon the shore,
> And sees the lifeboat go to save;
> And, all too weak to take an oar,
> I send a cheer across the wave

—a great deal that to the workers. What we want is not cynical criticism, or damping with faint praise, but the real, hearty sympathy of brothers and sisters. Then shall we have one day the classes and masses fused together in a brotherhood which nothing can separate, and into a democracy which shall rule the world.

THE CHURCH AND PRESENT DAY PROGRESS.

By the Rev. JAMES ADDERLEY, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Philip's Mission, Plaistow, and author of "Stephen Remarx."

Being the first of a Series of Advent Lectures, delivered at All Saints' Church, Margaret-street, on December 5th, 1894.

"Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's."—Deut. i. 16, 17.

OF all unreasonable separations there is none more unreasonable or unscriptural than the separation between social reformers and religious people; between social questions and the Christian religion. Such separation is entirely unknown in the Old Testament. It is impossible to imagine, for example, a prophet talking to one of the kings of Israel about the social or political matters of his day without referring to God, or without looking upon Him as the answer to the whole thing. Imagine Isaiah or Amos having a conversation with any one about the political

difficulties of their day, and not referring to God Almighty. And for us, who believe in the Incarnation, who believe that God Almighty has come down on earth and sanctioned all human effort which is in the right direction, for us to separate that which concerns humanity from that which concerns God is even more unreasonable and unscriptural.

Clearly, then, there must be something wrong in view of the fact that large numbers of men who are most concerned in matters of social reform are to a great extent alienated from the Church of Jesus Christ; and that we find those who call themselves by the name of the Son of Man to a great extent indifferent to the wants of those who are the sons of men; and that we find social reformers talking of making the world better without the aid of God who made it, or proposing to reconstitute society without Him who first made society; when we hear so much about the New Man and the New Woman, and the New Jerusalem, without a thought being given to Him Who alone can make all things new. The object of the Christian Social Union, then, and the object of these lectures during Advent, is to bring together those who are separated—not merely the rich and poor—but those who are concerned in the welfare of the nation with those who, calling themselves by the name of Jesus, are indifferent. The real danger we have to contend with is not the division between the classes and masses, but that between the classes who do care and the classes who do not.

How are these to be brought together? The first thing to impress upon the ordinary Churchman and Churchwoman is that there is a social question. For there are still many who require convincing. The clergy for the most part know of the existence of the social problem; indeed, they would be blind if they did not. But it is the ordinary Church layman who requires to be awakened. He thinks that things may very well go on as they are. But is there nothing the matter when we hear of two strikes a day in one year affecting no less than two hundred and eighty thousand persons? Is there nothing the matter when the unemployed increase yearly in numbers, being drawn not only from the ranks of the thriftless, the careless, the infirm, but also from the ranks of skilled workers? Is there nothing the matter when the sweating system goes on its hideous course, not only in the towns, but spreading in the villages? Is there nothing the matter when a hundred thousand people in London alone are living, as we know on absolutely reliable authority, without the ordinary necessaries of life, and thousands more without any of the joys of life? Is there nothing the matter, to look at another side, when men like Mr. Carter, our Secretary, can write such articles, and deliver such speeches as he has done on "Commercial Morality," and yet get in reply only feeble answers and feeble criticisms from business men, who declare that they cannot conduct business on Christian lines?

Then we have to convince people, not only that there is a social question, but that it is their duty to take part in the Social Reform Movement. They must learn to realise the fact that Socialists, whether some of their theories be right or wrong, are thoroughly in earnest. There are a large number of people who imagine the whole thing to be a huge joke, which can be pushed aside with a shrug of the shoulders, and a contemptuous reference to bombs and strikes and anarchism. All I can say is, I only wish that the Christian people who come to my Church and to Holy Communion were only half as earnest as the members of the Social Democratic Federation or of the Independent Labour Party. If Church people were only as eager to bring souls to Jesus as Socialists are about their own peculiar theories, I should thank God for it every day of my life. They may be mistaken; but let those who have never made a mistake cast the first stone. What we have to do is to go into the matter deeply. It cannot be shunted by merely calling the Socialists brigands. This object is the *raison d'être* of the Christian Social Union. We know many members have not the time for study; but we like them to go into social subjects as deeply as they can. Reforms cannot be done in a minute. In the meantime, people must study, and learn what are the difficulties with which we are concerned in the national life. The time has passed away when it was regarded as the settlement of a problem to give a sum of money. You will say that we have University settlements in the East-end, and ladies are giving up much of their time to district visiting. But it is necessary to look deeper for a solution of the social problem. Why, for instance, is it that men are starving in the richest country in the world? Mark you, so far the only school who have put forth any sort of programme for dealing with these matters are the social reformers. As we have been reminded in Mr. Kidd's great work, "Social Evolution," no satisfactory answer has been given to the Socialists. Till this has been done, it is absurd to dismiss the subject. It is useless for the Christian Church to think it has done its duty with the mere giving of alms, or the consolations of religion, as they are called, which consist in painting for the poor a sort of beautiful panorama of heaven, and telling them it will be all right some day. Well, I hope it will be all right, for the rich as well as the poor. But to confine one's methods or one's efforts to this sort of teaching is not only impolitic, but positively wicked, for it only gives half of what God Almighty came to tell us. He came also to teach that we can have the kingdom of heaven here on earth, for this is the meaning to be drawn from three-fourths of our Blessed Lord's parables. One wonders how any persons possessing a sense of humour can talk

to the poor about a heaven hereafter when they themselves are enjoying on this earth what has been called "a very living wage."

We must get beyond merely theorising about social questions. When we have studied hard, and gone deeply into the subject, we feel the next step is to do something. People say: Oh! but you must not encourage strikes. But there are lots of things one can do without encouraging strikes. Let ladies start factory girls' clubs, and endeavour to make the girls unite to abolish the sweating system. But what is needed above all is more heart and more earnestness. It was this that made Lord Shaftesbury one of the greatest of our social reformers. He was not a political economist, and certainly he was not a party politician; yet he entirely revolutionised the public attitude on social matters.

Church people must realise that they have in their hands the key of the social problem. At present they have not the courage of their convictions. They talk as if their work lay only with individuals. That shows clearly a want of trust in God Almighty Himself, as if He was only able to accomplish half His work. "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," said our Lord. To assert that His message is only to individuals is to assert that He was exaggerating. Christians must go out and claim the social movement as their own. "Oh!" people will say, "you are being led away by Socialists." We have no intention of being led away by Socialists. What we want is to lead them. Mr. Tom Mann said to me, "I want to capture the Church for the Labour Movement." I reply, "Not at all; we want to capture the Labour Movement for the Church."

How is it that we have the key of the social problem? How is it that we can do what Socialists fail to do? We have a Leader, which they have not. We believe in God Almighty, the Father of the whole human race, and therefore its Leader. We have the doctrine of the Incarnation, which gives a splendid inspiration for our social work. If Jesus Christ is almighty, then He can put right the world that has gone wrong, and bring back the society that has wandered from its Maker. Then our Gospel is not only for individuals, but for society as a whole. If a man, through drunkenness or impurity, has made a mess of his life, we point him to the Lamb of God. So, too, if society has gone astray, we should point it to the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. Indeed, reform cannot be accomplished without Him, but can be done with Him.

Ours is the religion of hope for society as well as for the individual. Many of the doctrines of the Socialists are Christian in character, as, for instance, the equality and brotherhood of man; but only Christians can preach these doctrines so that people will thoroughly believe them. It is no use talking of the brotherhood of man unless it is associated with the Fatherhood of God. This is the basis of the Christian religion. It stands to reason that if God is my Father, then all the world are my brothers and sisters.

But we have something more, the very key of the social problem; we have Divine grace. Many have turned aside from the theories of the Socialists, feeling that their ideal can never be attained under existing conditions when human nature is depraved. Christians know, however, that Christ came to this world that we might be called the sons of God. He gives us the grace of God by which men can be regenerated and turned from selfishness to unselfishness. The world repudiates this doctrine and hates the Church for teaching it. The day may be near when the Church will be paralysed, be scoffed at and crucified, and be nearly swept away. But, nevertheless, its Easter will come, when men will learn the innate power possessed by the Church in this matter of social reform.

Once more, we have a body, the Catholic Church, already organised for the purpose of undertaking the work of social regeneration; and when we see reformers floundering about endeavouring to realise on this earth the brotherhood of men, it is our duty to go out to tell them that there exists a body baptised into the Church of Christ, who are meant to realise here on earth the kingdom of God our Father, which is the very thing they are aiming at.

It is, dear friends, a pleasure to stand in this pulpit and say these things, for we of the Christian Social Union have been accused of going away from the traditions of Tractarianism. What I have been telling you this morning is an outcome of the Catholic Revival. It is because we, who belong to the High Church party, as it is called, have learned the lessons taught by the Tractarians, that we take up these lines to-day. We were not ready for it fifty or sixty years ago. Religion was then looked upon more as an individual matter. Then came the Revival which restored the belief in a Divine society. The kingship of Jesus Christ, the reality of the sacraments, the brotherhood of men, are High Church teaching. Had the Social Reform Movement begun fifty years ago we should not have been ready for it, for we scarcely believed in ourselves, and had no resources at hand. So far from being in antagonism to the old Tractarian Movement, our efforts are the outcome of it.

And now, in conclusion, let me plead with you to be practical about all these matters. Get thoroughly discontented with yourself if you are merely rich, or merely idle, or merely a Churchgoer, and nothing more; try to realise all that Holy Communion means; and do not regard it as something beginning and ending with yourself. I was talking the other day to the Archbishop

of Canterbury, when he said these remarkable words: "Why, the phrase 'my communion' is a contradiction in terms: it is 'our communion.'" Realise what the Eucharistic sacrifice means. Consider how, in the Eucharist, we lift up before the whole world the great social reformer —Jesus Christ. Individually do something to hasten the kingdom of God here on earth. If an employer of labour, you can do much. Don't wait till Parliament compels you to make improvements, or undertake repairs. Our duty is to see that each of us personally carries his religion out into the social matters that are his own individual concern. Of course you must be prepared to be called by many harsh names. But remember this, my last word: the Social Movement in this country will go on whether we like it or not. The question is whether it will be led by God or be led by the devil; and it rests with the national Church to decide that it shall be led by God. It is a hopeful sign that most of the Labour leaders are Christian men. They are constantly appealing to the Church to take this or that step. But it rests with us who know the whole truth to go out and take them by the hand and lead them—not patronisingly, of course, for they have a great deal to teach us that we do not know; but meet them as men and women, brothers and sisters. And in that way we shall bring about the kingdom of heaven upon earth.

IT was recently announced that the vicarage of Sheffield had been offered to Canon Eyre. We now learn he has accepted it.

THE rectory of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, vacant by the death of the Rev. S. Flood Jones, has been given by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster to the Rev. H. R. Gamble. The new rector has been for some few years curate to Canon Duckworth, whose turn it was to present.

AMONG the special Lenten services in London we may note that Canon Body is preaching at Kensington Parish Church on Wednesday mornings. Father Black is preaching at the Church of the Good Shepherd, Kentish Town, on Sunday evenings. Mr. Black also preaches at St. Paul's, Great Portland Street, on Wednesdays at noon.

THE funeral of the Dean of Ripon took place only a few days ago. It was, therefore, scarcely to be expected that we should hear of his successor's appointment. Canon MacColl's name has been mentioned, and he would no doubt be acceptable to the present dispensers of ecclesiastical patronage, if he cares to sever himself from London which is doubtful. We do not know whether Lord Rosebery reads the Church newspapers, but probably the Lord Chancellor does, and if he does he cannot but be aware that grave dissatisfaction has been created by the one-sided character of recent appointments. A mere "Evangelical growl" may be sneered at, but the Prime Minister really requires to be reminded that the Church of England contains learned and devoted priests who are not members of the Christian Social Union or High Church Radicals.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 23, 1895.

PROGRESSIVE AMENITIES.

AFTER all, the result of the first meeting of the London County Council is not one to quarrel with. The aldermen are divided, the odd one certainly not being a Progressive, while the late majority claim all three chairmen. Of course, in theory, this is very bad. What would be thought and said of a Conservative Government which, having appealed to the country with a majority of about 3 to 1, had been returned without a majority at all, claiming to retain office and continue the policy submitted to the country at the polls on the strength of a casual majority in the House of Lords? Yet the Progressive position is nearly similar, in continuing to usurp office and lay claim to public confidence, by right of a majority of aldermen elected by themselves at a time when they possessed the confidence which has now been withdrawn. By doing this the Progressives outrage the principle of democracy which they pretend to represent. If they accepted the sovereign will of the people, about which they freely talk, they would frankly admit that their policy of the last three years has been mistaken, and would seek to place themselves in harmony with the public feeling which has found expression at the polls. On the contrary, they profess to stick to their policy, and, in effect, ignore the check they have received. We thus have the spectacle of men who have claimed, with peculiar self-assertiveness, to represent in its integrity the people's will, actually resisting their will, and refusing to accept their decision, when cast against themselves. But this is the time-worn custom of the demagogue. There is no such thing as pure democracy, and

never will be. Democracy, sooner or later, comes to mean government by groups and sections, and the autocracy of the odd man. We have already seen this in the County Council too clearly displayed in the extraordinary influence, one might nearly say supremacy, of the fanatic and the faddist. We have now a clearer illustation still in the almost cynical indifference to the popular verdict shown by the beaten party, who persist in assuming that the losing is the winning cause.

But the estimable common-sense of Londoners may be left to deal with the vagaries of the demagogue. What is of more importance is that the Progressives, by usurping all the offices, have not bettered their position, but rather the contrary. Inside the Council they have not gained voting strength, outside they have lost influence and popularity. Meanwhile they are left in unenviable possession of responsibility without power. They are in office, the initiative will rest with them ; the policy to be followed must emanate from them. And yet they will be unable to insist rigorously upon any point of it. The Moderates, who have hitherto been a neglectable quantity on the Council, are now really masters of the situation, and the Progressives will be able to do very little without asking their leave.

For us this is almost an ideal state of things. There is no danger of the reactionaries getting their head, and undoing or hindering the work of the Council for good. This is very well, for there is always plenty of reactionary feeling about; there are fossils among Moderates, just as there are faddists among Progressives, and a fossil is quite as mischievous as a faddist, though perhaps not worse. On the other hand, there is little further risk of the worst extravagancies identified with the cause of the Progressives. The new heaven and the new earth people will have to restrain their ardour and put up with Providence, upon whom, indeed, they have so far failed to improve. In fact there is at last some hope of the Council settling down to the exercise of its proper functions, without roaming over the whole field of social affairs, poking a finger into every pie, and minding every business under the sun except its own. Without anticipating anything like a fusion between the two parties, their present relations will bring them to understand one another better. The Moderates will no longer find their opinions ignored, and their rights as a minority trampled on. The Progressives will have to give up bullying their opponents, and swelling and ruffling in the conviction of their own infallibility and omniscience. This will make party feeling less bitter, there will be less provocation, and less resentment, and an increasing tendency to give and take, which will have its effect upon the work of the Council.

Of course all this will not happen at once. No doubt a storm or two will be required to clear the air. The two parties must blow off steam and have time to take in the true position of affairs, and realise this neither of them is quite master. When they have done that, we may confidently hope that London's third County Council will do more work and better than either of the other two.

CHURCH NOTES.

LORD HALIFAX has really gone to Rome. We hasten to add, however, that it is only as a tourist, and not as a suppliant for admission to the Roman Church. That, at any rate, is all we are warranted in believing, though the gossips at Rome have put it about that the visit is of importance, and that the President of the E.C.U. is actually going to lay a scheme of reunion before the Pope. It is just conceivable, but nobody should believe it except upon better authority than is yet forthcoming.

The parish of Christ Church, Gipsy Hill, vacant by the death of the Rev. R. Allen, has been offered to the Rev. R. C. Joynt, of St. George's, Sheffield. It is stated, however, that great efforts are being put forth to induce him to stay where he is.

Count Campello, who is labouring to establish a Reformed Catholic Church in Italy in communion with the Church of England, has been very seriously ill at Rome. He has been nursed by the Sisters of the Sacred Heart, and, according to an Italian correspondent of the *Rock*, attempts were made to induce him to recant. But, adds the correspondent, Count Campello proved equal to the occasion, and, while acknowledging and being grateful for the kindness he was receiving from those around him, who were the devoted adherents and missionaries of the Papacy, firmly declined any priestly services. He sent for his old friend, the Pastor of the American Episcopal Church, St. Paul's Within the Walls, the Rev. Dr. Nevin, who administered to him the Holy Eucharist, and has since been constant in his comforting ministrations.

Mr. Gore resigned the vicarage of Radley on his appointment to a canonry at Westminster. He is succeeded in the Berkshire benefice by the Rev. J. O. Nash.

Bishop Pearson, formerly of Newcastle, New South Wales, has just died at the age of 54. His first benefice was the vicarge of Horningsea, in Cambridgeshire, to which he was appointed in 1871. He was Whitehall preacher from 1872 to 1874, and Hulsean lecturer and Ramsden preacher in 1872. Two years later he was appointed vicar of Newark, remaining there until, in 1880, he was consecrated to the see of Newcastle. After labouring in this diocese for about ten years, Dr. Pearson became extremely ill, and some difficulty was caused by his inability to take the necessary steps for resigning his see. Ultimately this was surmounted, and he was succeeded in the bishopric in 1891 by Dr. Stanton, Bishop of North Queensland. Dr. Pearson, however, recovered, and was appointed Vicar of Leck in 1893.

The removal of the Rev. Dr. Dale—"Dale of Birmingham"—will be felt as a loss to theological literature, as well as in many other ways. No Nonconformist, at least of recent years, has had so many readers among cultivated Churchmen. His book on the Atonement has been praised by as competent

judges as the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Durham, and, besides being universally read at home and in the United States, has been translated into German and French. There is no reason to think that Dr. Dale ever doubted the stability of his position as a Nonconformist, but he had strong sympathies with the Church, and, curiously enough, with the Anglo-Catholic rather than the Evangelical section.

It was, perhaps, not more than an accident that Canon Gore was his visitor during the Church Congress at Birmingham a year or two ago, but there was much, we suspect, in which host and guest found themselves at one. The High Church theory of the spirituality of the Christian Kingdom, as opposed to Erastianism in any form, heartily commended itself to Dale. It was this, indeed, rather than political Radicalism, which made him so strong an opponent of national establishments of religion. His views on the sacrament of the Holy Communion were, moreover, not those favoured by Dissenters or extreme Low Churchmen, but rather in accord with Moderate Anglican doctrine.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Christ came to seek and save. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke xix. 19). Introduction.—The great object of the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was to redeem, to seek, to save, to reconcile those that were gone far away from the Father. He came voluntarily. He said, "Lo, I will do Thy will and redeem them." There was none other to redeem. Jesus trod the wine-press alone, and brought us salvation. Ah, brethren, remember—

Come, fall before His Cross,
Who shed for us His blood;
Who died, the victim of pure love,
To make us sons of God.

There was no other in the infinite mind of the Father good enough to redeem. He gave us His only begotten Son, "that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life."

O the wisdom of the Eternal!
O the depth of love Divine!
O the sweetness of that mercy
Which in Jesus Christ did shine!
We were sinners doomed to die;
Jesus paid the penalty.

How many there are who give no heed to the Gospel, call ringing through the land by His ministers, teachers by His Holy Spirit's strivings, by the revelation of His holy word. There is no other name we can be saved by, there is no other way, there is no other means or way of deliverance. The lost, the weary, the heavy laden, those steeped in the lowest state of degradation and sin, He came to save and deliver. Oh, come now! if you stay away, it will make it harder. Come now, for, behold, now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation. Let us apply a few practical lessons:—1. Christ our only means of deliverance. 2. Christ alone brought salvation. 3. Christ came to save and seek the lost. 4. Christ alone can make us free from the bondage of Satan. 5. Christ is ready to receive, pardon, and give peace.

'Tis eternal life to know Him.
Oh, how He loves!

—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

WHAT WE KNOW OF GOD BY REASON APART FROM SCRIPTURE.

THE Rev. Prebendary J. W. Reynolds in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, March 13th, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of St. Anne and St. Agnes, Gresham Street, E.C., stated:—About the first fact in the world's history, of which there is existing trace, is the appearance of light. That brings us to about the limit of our physical knowledge, and it is a mystery. We only know that it is caused by molecular movements acting on the universal ether. Atheists cannot account for it. Scripture states "God said, Let there be light." As the light is not eternal, no better account can be given.

The idea of Divine existence is more than a thought about which we reason. It is a truth that the heart feels, the mind apprehends, the experience realises, as a moral heart-throb telling of a Higher Power.

The idea was earlier than faith, faith rested on it; preceded religion, for it made religion possible. It is not a child of ignorance and superstition, for it leads to highest knowledge and purest worship. It is the ground of philosophy and the crown of science, as representing the Eternal who makes, explains, and continues the worlds.

Evolution, in the hands of atheists, is put in the place of creation. We are glad to know that the cosmic harmony is not by myriad efforts, but an enlargement in nature of one thought, and possibly one act of God; and this disproves every statement as to there not being any directive principle. It is silly talk about plants selecting; fishes, birds, beasts selecting; sexual selection and natural selection. There is nothing of the kind. The explanation is found in the thought and act of the Eternal more and more developing in nature. To deny Personality to God, and then attributing a spurious personality to animals in particular, and to nature in general, is a mark of dulness or of a small craftiness. To refuse the highest title to God, and then pretend to confer on birds and beasts the power of adaptation, bears the stamp of folly.

The main intelligible principles of Godhead in nature discerned by our reason are: Unity in power and purpose (this led all peoples to believe in God); intelligibleness and order, witnessing to the work of mind; causation, not a mere sequence of antecedent and consequent, but, by an efficient cause, accomplishing a purposed result; life, coming as do many other marvels, with sensation, thought, morals, show a work of universal agreement rich in contrasts. All these are as lights Divinely kindled.

Dreams, visions, prophecies, and other miraculous powers are startling phenomena. Not unnatural, but making the outward world, in which God was invisibly manifested, to have an inward dealing for the mind and spirit.

All unbelief as to the Divine is a mark of ignorance. The unbeliever says, "I do not know." Let him strive to know, not by levelling himself down to the beast, for the higher realities are not attained by the lower. Let him think truly, think up to his best, and better that day by day. The elevation of his spirit will soon attain, in peace and visions of beauty, true knowledge of the glorious God.

The lecture next Wednesday will be on "Reason as Basis of Faith."

Reviews and Notices.

"As Others Saw Him."—Wm. Heinemann.

PICTURES of Jesus are seldom satisfactory, whether in paint or in print, and we have had rather a surfeit of late years. But the present one, entitled "As Others Saw Him"—others who were not attracted and not converted—has certainly the merit of originality, and the glory thrown on the Central Figure is perhaps the stronger in that it is thrown from the Jewish and unsympathetic side. The author is conversant with the picturesque beauties of the Jewish traditions and ceremonial, and ventures upon a sketch of the influences that developed Jesus's strange powers and subversive teaching, which is decidedly suggestive. Without alluding to the possible school or society (Nazarite) to which students now refer the unknown decade of the Redeemer's life, the author attributes much to a certain summary of Hillel's teaching (about 30 B.C.) called "The Two Ways," and to the direct instruction of Jochanan ben Zacharia Ha-Cohen, "the Baptiser," a cousin of Jesus (John the Baptist). It is not uninstructive to view the Son of Man in an unaccustomed light, the "dry light" of contemporaneous social criticism—a medium not unlike that in which modern municipal and suburban eyes would see such a figure if He came to-day amongst us before He was realised as the Christ.

The book purports to be letters to one Aglaophonos, a Greek physician, from Meshullam ben Zadok, a Jewish scribe at Alexandria, who remembered Jesus at Jerusalem, and who, as a member of the dignified Sanhedrin, and one governed by the opinions of his class like many more of us, had at first looked down on the workman who took liberties with the sacred Temple; afterwards came to look up to him as a great Rabbi, if not something more; and finally was persuaded that the man was a danger to the nation, and unwillingly gave his vote for his death.

The opening scene is quaint enough, showing under what circumstances Jesus was able to do what Jews constantly deny as impossible—viz., scourge out the privileged money-changers and beasts for sale, which was a breach of the priestly law, and a direct attack on priestly privileges; and how the irate High Priest Annas had them all sent back immediately afterwards. A new colour is given to the Man of Sorrows by the vituperation of the ejected money-changers, "Mamzer! Mamzer!" (bastard). The cry rings through the whole book, and gives a personal point to His "acquaintance with grief," which will be better understanded of the ancestor-worshipping Jew, than of the Englishman who does not want to live up to his problematic pedigree so much as to make his individual mark on his age. To the Jew, such a taunt cut him off from his "world" and threw him upon the company of the poor and outcast, whose troubles he naturally understood, and whose cause he espoused; so that, if he was careless of the nation's hopes (writes the Scribe), may it not have been because he felt himself outside the nation? and his most un-Jewish dictum, "Let the dead bury their dead," no doubt carries out the idea.

Throughout the book the harsh side of Jesus is shown rather than His sympathetic side. That He could say hard things we know. There are few teachers and clergy to-day who would dare to say to a humble creature crying after them: "It is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs." He was somewhat harsh to the mother who bare Him—with a slur—Miriam, wife of the wheelwright Joseph ben Eli—and in this disobeyed the Talmudic injunction to love the mother before the father. He was hard on the rich young man, on the Scribes and Pharisees, even whilst He accepted their hospitalities, on the priests who asked for His genealogy, or who "tempted" Him (tested Him, as was customary, rather) as to His authority to overthrow priestly convenances, and to use magic as Jochanan did; but He was tenderer than the law to women in general, even the sinful ones, and to little children.

Those good people who occupy themselves with the conversion of the Jews little understand the attitude of mind in a conscientious Jew (and without conscientiousness what were his Christianity worth?), any more than Shakespeare understood the Chosen People when he made Jessica, in the "Merchant of Venice," false to her religion and false to her filial duty—two impieties which mean far more amongst the Jews than amongst the Christians. A good Jew cannot condone an affront to the Sacred Law nor forgive what he conceives to be blasphemy against God and accepted Authority, and the book before us shows us clearly why the catastrophe was inevitable.

It contains a good deal of local colour, not in the way of "descriptions" which weary, and landscape ornament got up from Baedeker, but in the atmosphere of the period. One chief point was the perplexity amongst the Jewish parties, Pharisee, Zealot, Essenoi, and what not—they could not label Jesus. Now He seemed to be of the Sadducees, now of the Pharisees, now of the Ebionim. Therefore He could make no friends who would support Him in the time of need. He defied received opinion by inculcating obedience to the law which He broke Himself, and by associating with the tax-gatherer, the hetærai, and the "beasts of the people," and the "reputable" part of society was naturally alienated.

There is a very graphic picture of Jesus preaching in the Galilæan synagogue after the messenger of the congregation called out "Let Rabbi Joshua ben Joseph arise." "Never heard I one whose voice so thrilled me." Jesus's discourse is given, of course, in a very meagre skeleton—and to it are attributed the *Agrapha*, so known in modern theology—words of weight and force sent home by His extraordinary personal magnetism.

"Only one saying of His have I heard wherein He said aught at variance with the Torah. When the children of a man, who had recently died, asked Him in what way should the property be divided, He said, "Let son and daughter inherit alike." In this, as in other things, He was more favourable to the claims of the women than the Law or the Sages. For this reason, perhaps, it was that many women followed after Him, even joined in prayer with Him and those with Him, *against the custom of our nation.*"

What sent Jesus to execution (not by the merciful Jewish form of capital punishment, a modified "stoning," but the hideous and indecent Romish crucifixion) was but the mistakes of His followers. "How often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not!"

The desperate pride of the insurgent Jews, fixed on temporal redemption, blundered like an ox through the interlineate distinctions by the young Rabbi between the law of God which they "could not bear now," and that law of the world about Him which

they could not yet dispense with. His friends fell away from Him like smoke when they interpreted His teaching to mean their continued subjection to the hated alien rule.

There is a graphic touch again, where the faded rose-wreath of some Roman reveller is placed on Jesus's head, and the thorns tore His flesh. Again, when the populace cry out for the release of Jesus (but they mean Jesus Bar Abbas, quite a different leader), and a third where the writer could see for a moment by the lightning-flash three crosses raised on the top of Golgotha, "Which of these held Jesus I knew not."

The intense pathos of the situation, of the apparent insignificance of the whole thing at the time, of the horse-play, the anger of the priesthood, the irreconcilable double rule at Jerusalem, the misgivings, the repentance, all come out picturesquely in the book, and are cleverly put into the mind of a non-sympathiser who, like Martha of Bethany, and similarly cumbered with much serving, long survived the misunderstood Prophet, and a real perception of what he had done came to whom, as to Pilate, too late—a quarter of a century too late.

The book is certainly fresh and bright as to the aspect in which it places the Author of our religion. The literary treatment is just so good that it ought to have been better, and the author will do well to continue and elaborate his studies in the present striking direction.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

SIR,—Since the day that St. Paul stood on Mars' Hill, and first preached the Gospel to the philosophers of Athens, the Christian Church has never ceased to proclaim the same message (Acts xvii. 18). She has thus taught sixty generations of mortal men to look for the Resurrection of the Dead.

The Roman Creed (which there can be little doubt represents the Baptismal Confession of the middle of the second century, and which, in its complete form, familiar to us as the Apostle's Creed, gained general currency in the West after the eighth century) expresses belief in the "Resurrection of the Flesh" (*σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις, carnis resurrectio*). "As often as we repeat the Creed of our Baptism, we repeat the words by which martyrs have lived and died . . . the words which have remained, through every vicissitude, the standard of Christian belief" (Bishop Westcott). Clement of Rome, in the first century, the Latin Fathers Tertullian, Jerome, and that great Doctor of the West, Augustine, who, as Hooker says, has been "without any equal in the Church of Christ from that day to this," all teach the "Resurrection of the Flesh." Irenæus (A.D. 180), who presided over an important Church in the West, but who in earlier days in the East had sat at the feet of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, says:—"The souls of the departed go to the place assigned them by God, and there abide till the Resurrection, when they will be reunited to their bodies; and then the Saints, both in body and soul, will come into the presence of God." The Greek Fathers, Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 350) and Chrysostom (A.D. 400) also held and taught the "Resurrection of the Flesh" The Athanasian Creed, which "appears to have been well known, commented on and treated with great respect as early as the middle of the sixth century" (Bishop Harold Browne) (and which, therefore, is a valuable historical witness) declares that "all men shall rise again with their ('own' bodies, *cum corporibus suis*), and shall give account for their own works." The Prymer (*circ.* A.D 1400), "commonly mentioned in the fifteenth century as a well-known book of private devotion," declares, "I bileue in . . . agenisyng of fleish."

Luther, on Easter Sunday, 1544, preached on the Resurrection:—"I shall arise again, and shall speak with you; this finger wherewith I point must come to me again; everything must come again . . . we ourselves, delivered from our mundane subjection to gross appetites and necessities, shall have the same form as here, but infinitely more perfect." Bishop Pearson, in his masterpiece, says, "It is also necessary that the same flesh should be raised again; for, if either the same body should be joined to another soul, or the same soul united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man." Long before, Gregory the Great (A.D 600) (who sent Augustine on his mission to Christianise England) had written, "Nam, si in *alio* corpore resurrexero, jam non ero *ego* qui resurgam." Bishop Pearson further observes, "the identity of the body raised from death is so necessary that the very name of the *Resurrection* doth include or suppose it." So, it might be added, doth the word "*Redemption*" include or suppose it; for death being the wages and doom of sin, redemption from sin must imply the rescue and ransoming and restoration of the body. If the body is to be un-made, it is that it may be re-made. Otherwise, after all, the grave can boast of victory. The same Saviour who "has put away sin" has also "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light" (Rom. vi. 23; Heb. ix. 26; 2 Tim. i. 10).

"The followers of our Saviour, while they looked upon our bodies living as temples of the Holy Ghost, and bought by Christ, to be made one day like unto His glorious body, they thought them no ways to be neglected after death, but carefully to be laid up in the wardrobe of the grave." It was this care for the burial of the dead by which (with two other things), as Julian the Apostate thought, the Christians gained upon the world.

The resurrection of the body is by no means contrary to reason; for it is in the highest degree reasonable that Almighty God should perfect His Creation; and how can He do so without redeeming and restoring man, the dethroned and discrowned King and Head of Creation (Gen. i. 26–28; ii. 17; iii. 17–19). "Is it imaginable that God should restore all things to man, and not restore man to himself?" No one, up to the present time, has suggested a more reasonable theory of the universe. And this doctrine, moreover, satisfies the heart. "The whole Creation groans and travails in pain . . . and we ourselves"—who are not "magnetic mockeries" or "cunning casts in clay,"

> "But beings breathing thoughtful breath,
> And travellers betwixt life and death"

—"we ourselves groan within ourselves, wailing for . . . the redemption of our body" (Rom. viii. 23).

"'The Resurrection and the Life
Am I; believe, and die no more,'
Unchanged that voice—and though not yet
The dead sit up and speak,
Answering its call; we gladlier rest
Our darlings on earth's quiet breast,
And our hearts feel they must not break."

The Church of England, standing firmly on the Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture (Art. VI., VIII.), speaks with no uncertain sound, proclaiming this doctrine of the "Resurrection of the Flesh," not only in her Baptismal Service, but also in that for the Visitation of the Sick, while in the administration of the Holy Communion she uses the words "preserve thy *body* and soul unto everlasting life."

St. John, the great Apostle of the East, unites with St. Paul, the great Apostle of the West, in declaring that Christ is "the Firstborn from the dead" (Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5). Compare Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 25-28; Acts x. 41; and St. Paul further says, that the Resurrection of Christ is the assurance of the Judgment to come, and that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the things done in his *body* . . . . whether it be good or bad"; and he declares that it is "this corruptible" which "must put on incorruption" and "this mortal" which "must put on immortality" (τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο, τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο) (Acts xvii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 54; 2 Cor. v. 10).

Wherefore, in spite of the Sadducee, who asserts that the soul dies with the body—in spite of the Manichæan, who deems the body essentially corrupt—in spite of the Essene, who believes in the immortality of the soul alone, and in spite of the benighted Hindoo, who teaches the transmigration of the soul—all of whom "err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God" (Matt. xxii. 29), "We can no otherwise expound this article teaching the Resurrection of the Body, than by asserting that the bodies which have lived and died, shall live again after death, and that the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored; whatsoever alteration shall be made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition; not of their substance, but of their qualities, which explication is most agreeable to the language of the Scriptures, to the principles of Religion, to the constant profession of the Church, against the Origenists of old and the Socinians of late."

H. HEBER EVANS.

March 4th, 1895.

BIRD PROTECTION.

SIR,—If there is one time of the year more than another when our wild birds seem to ask us to protect them it is now at the close of winter. And what a hard time it has been for the poor birds during the past two months of storm and snow. Their first notes of the season are, however, at length beginning to remind us that spring will soon be dawning upon us, and in a few weeks or less many a happy pair will be engaged in the exquisitely delicate and wonderful work of nest-making.

No one deserves to enjoy the pleasures of a country life who is not glad and ready to do what he can in defending our feathered friends from thoughtless cruelty and senseless or wanton slaughter.

So many touching appeals on behalf of birds and dumb creatures have been made from this place in past years by one whose voice can now no more be heard that I venture to hope that even my faltering utterances may catch the ears of some if I take up a similar strain.

One hopes that in England we may never reach such a pitch of barbaric cruelty with regard to our feathered songsters as that which we have lately been told rages in Italy at the present time. The picture of the state of things in that country, as drawn by a well-known writer in a recent number of the *Nineteenth Century*, is a melancholy one indeed. It would seem as if in that fair and classic land everything in the shape of a bird was to be cruelly hunted to death by monsters of humanity who know, or at least show, no mercy.

We in this country, whatever our faults, have not yet come to that. Still there is enough of cruelty daily practised among us to fill us with sad reflections. Hundreds of thousands of useful and beautiful birds are yearly slaughtered in England for no other possible reason than for slaughter's sake. Many of our most interesting birds, formerly common, are rapidly becoming rare, while others that were less common are scarcely, if ever, now seen at all. Is there anything to be done to remedy this before it is too late? The law happily helps us to a considerable extent, but its aims are not wide-embracing enough. The close time should be prolonged. Surely it is not too much to expect that our birds should be protected for at least six months of the year, say from March 1st to August 31st, instead of to July 31st as is now usually the case. Let us urge Members of Parliament and County Councillors to have this extension made, if possible, uniformly over the whole country, and the eggs should be protected as well as the birds themselves.

The usefulness of the Society for the Protection of Birds, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the recently formed Church Society for the Promotion of Kindness to Animals should be more widely made known. Many excellent leaflets and papers have been published by these societies, which might be more generally distributed with great advantage. In every market town there might be a Bird Protection Society whose influence would radiate into the surrounding district. The clergy should advocate the claims of these and similar societies, and especially the Church Society for the Promotion of Kindness to Animals, the office of which is at the Church House, Westminster. Sermons might be preached from time to time (once a year at least) on the duty of kindness to animals from a Christian standpoint.

But what would, I believe, do more good than all the societies put together is for those who are charged with the instruction of the young to teach their scholars more about birds and animals generally, about their ways and habits in their wild or free state, and especially about the humane treatment which all those creatures are entitled to with which we have to do or which come in any way within our reach. I am glad in this connection to know that Mr. Acland has consented to receive a deputation of the Church Society for the Promotion of Kindness to Animals asking that instruction in the nature and particular requirements of animals be part of the curriculum in every State-aided school.

It is often said that boys are naturally cruel. I, for one, cannot bring myself to think this of them. It might be nearer the truth to say that boys are naturally thoughtless. This thoughtlessness a little kindly

and intelligent teaching would soon remove, and the result would be that a vast amount of needless suffering and torture on the part of defenceless dumb creatures would be prevented, and the lives of the young people themselves would be rendered all the happier and brighter in consequence.

M. C. F. MORRIS.

Nunburnholme Rectory,
Hayton, York,
March 12th, 1895.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bailey, Rev. J. H. E., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Burscough, Ormskirk; Vicar of St. George's, Whitwick, Leicestershire.
Baker, Rev. William De Foe, M.A.; Rector of Snelland, Lincoln.
Baxter, Rev. William; Vicar of Barrow-on-Trent, with the Chapelry of Twyford annexed.
Binks, Rev. Barnabas; Vicar of Alwinton, Northumberland.
Brearley, Rev. J. B., M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Whitwick, Leicester; Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist, Burscough Bridge, Ormskirk.
Burn, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Bolton, Penrith; Vicar of Christ Church, Carlisle.
Carlyle, Rev. Alexander James. Fellow and Theological Tutor of University College, Oxford; Rector of St. Martin and All Saints', Oxford.
Collinson, Rev. T. H., Curate of St. James's, Whitehaven; Rector of Newton Reigny, Penrith.
Cornwall Rev. A. W., Rector of Coleford; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for the Deanery of S. Forest.
Davies, Rev. Evan, late Curate of Newport; Vicar of Mynachlogddu, Pembrokeshire.
Davies, Rev. Henry Lewis, Vicar of Eglwysfach; Secretary of the National Society for Llanrwst Deanery.
Evans, Rev. John Owen, Vicar of Tretower; Secretary of the National Society for Crickhowell Deanery.
Ferris, Rev. Alfred Henry, M.A., Vicar of Gwennap; Secretary of the National Society for Carnmarth Deanery.
Ferry, Rev Joseph Bull; Vicar of Welton, Lincoln.
Frend, Rev. J. Palliser; Private Chaplain to Earl Ferrers, and General Licence for the Diocese of Peterborough.
Greenstreet, Rev. Cecil Warde, B.A.; Chaplain to Devon County School.
Griffith, Rev. Morris, B.A., Vicar of Llangoed; Secretary of the National Society for Tindaethwy Deanery.
Houghton, Rev. E. J.; Vicar of Brookthorpe-with-Whaddon, Gloucester.
Hudson, Rev. Edgar T., M.A.; Vicar of Gosberton, Spalding.
Jacques, Rev. William Baldwin, M.A., Vicar of Whittle-le-Woods; Rector of St. Mary's, Burton Latimer, Kettering.
James, Ven. William Evan, M.A., Vicar of Abergwili; Perpetual Curate of Llanfihangel Uwchgwili, Carmarthenshire
Jillings, Rev. W. J., B.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Bow, E.; Tutor of the Preparatory Class, St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead.
Johnston, Rev. J. O., M.A., late Vicar of All Saints', Oxford; Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College.
Jones, Rev. David Sinnett, Curate of Edegru and Llithfaen; Rector of Rhiw, Carnarvonshire.
Jones, Rev. Richard Foulkes, B.A., Senior Minor Canon of Bangor Cathedral; Rector of Llanfair Yn Nghornwy-with-Llanrhwydrys, Anglesey.
Kenrick, Rev. C. W. H., Vicar of Caversham, Reading; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for the Henley Deanery.
Lamb, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Leeds; Vicar of Clapham, Lancaster.
Launder, Rev. H. C., B.A., Rector of Brompton Ralph; Vicar of Nynehead, Somersetshire.
Macdona, Rev. L.; Vicar of Acton, Suffolk.
Matthew, Rev. D. S., M.A.; Vicar of Wellingore, Lincoln.
Meade, Rev. Richard Corker, D.D., Vicar of St. Neots; Rural Dean of St. Neots.
Mills, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., Curate; Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Westexe, Tiverton.
Morgan, Rev. John, late Curate of St. David's, Liverpool; Vicar of St. Dogmael's-with-Llantood and Monington, Pembrokeshire.
Parry. Rev. Edward, Curate of Uttoxeter; Vicar of Malins Lee in Dawley, Salop.
Peacock, Rev. Frederick K.; Vicar of North Leverton-with-Habblesthorpe, Lincoln.
Pratt, Rev. C. T., M.A., Vicar of Cawthorne, Barnsley; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Silkstone (II.) Deanery.
Roberts, Rev. Thomas, M.A.; R.N. Chaplain to the *Dreadnought.*
Solloway, Rev. John, M.A., Senior Curate of Scarborough; Rector of Holy Trinity, Micklegate, York.
Suttie, Rev. J. T., Vicar of Christ Church, Carlisle; Vicar of Bolton, Penrith.
Thomas, Rev. George, B.A., Rector of Bedwas; Secretary of the National Society for Llandaff Upper Deanery (North-East).
Thomson, Rev. Francis Drake, M.A., Vicar of Barrow-on-Soar; Secretary of the National Society for Akeley Deanery (East).
Tomlin, Rev. A. G., B.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Bristol; Vicar of Kingston, Taunton, Somerset.
Toolis, Rev. T. S.; Rector of Croxton with-Eltisley, St. Neots.
Tweed, Rev. Edward Martin, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.
Twist, Rev. J. J., M.A.; Vicar of Castle Hedingham, Essex.
Waters, Rev. F. E., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hope; Rural Dean of Hanley.
Watson, Rev. H. G.; Vicar of Great Staughton, St. Neots.
Way, Rev. W. H. Bromley; Rector of Warboys, Huntingdon.
Webb, Rev. M. F., Rector of Donnington, Ledbury; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for S. Frome Deanery.
White, Rev. Henry Julian, M.A., Vice-Principal of Salisbury Theological College; Theological Lecturer, Tutor, and Chaplain of Merton College, Oxford.
Williams, Rev. Richard, Vicar of Beddgelert; Secretary of the National Society for Eifionydd Deanery.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blaker, Rev. Walter Isaacson, at the Vicarage, Easterton, Devizes, on the 12th inst.
Everard, Rev. Canon Salisbury, at Burgate Rectory, on the 13th inst., aged 86.
Hall, Rev. John William, M.A., late Vicar of South Baddesley, Lymington, Hants, at 14, Carnarvon-road, High Barnet, on the 11th inst., aged 82.
Hamilton, Rev. Charles Gillingham, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin, Vicar of Handforth, Cheshire, and formerly Head Master of Stockport Grammar School, on the 10th inst., aged 74.
Heathcote, Rev. George, Honorary Canon of Ely, formerly for fifty years Rector of Conington, at 5, Arlington-street, on the 9th inst., aged 84.
Heywood, Rev. Henry Robinson, Vicar of Swinton, at Moorfield, Swinton, on the 12th inst., aged 62.
Hodge, Rev. Charles Francis Dalton, M.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist, Blackburn, at Middleton Vicarage, Warwickshire, on the 15th inst., aged 55.
Hodgson, Rev. Richard, for twenty-five years Vicar, at St. Margaret's Vicarage, Dunham Massey, Altrincham, on the 14th inst., aged 66.
Kennard, Rev. Robert Bruce, for thirty-seven years Rector of the Parish, at Marnhull Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 70.
Pearson, Right Rev. Josiah Brown, Vicar, formerly Bishop of Newcasle, N.S.W., at Leck, on the 10th inst., aged 54.
Pryce, Rev. Hugh Lewis, M.A., Rector of Llanfair-yn-Nghornwy, Anglesey.
Rodwell, Rev. Robert Mandeville, thirty-one years Rector of the Parish, at High Laver Rectory, Ongar, Essex, on the 15th inst., aged 73.
Rogers, Rev. Sir Edward, at Blatchford, Ivy Bridge, Devon, on the 9th inst., aged 75.
Smith, Rev. Edward Langdale, for fifty-six years Vicar of Chetwode, at Chetwode Vicarage, on the 10th inst., aged 83.
Whalley, Rev. John Christopher, at Grove-hill, Tunbridge Wells, on the 15th inst., aged 88.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MOUNTAINS TO LAY LOW.

By the Rev. T. C. Fry, D.D., Head-Master of Berkhamsted School.

Preached in Holy Trinity Church, Sloane-Street on Sunday Evening, December 9th, 1894, the Second of an Advent Series in connection with the Christian Social Union.

"Every mountain and hill shall be made low."—Isaiah xl. 4

At home the Israelite loved his mountains; to him as to all lovers of mountains they were full of God; He had set them fast as a symbol of His righteousness, the dew that fell upon them was Jehovah's grace, they were eternal as the heavens. Nay, more, the haunt of God was in the mountain that He had purchased—in Mount Zion that He loved. To leave these, to lay low the sacred highlands like the plains of Moab or the vast flats of lower Egypt, would have been desecration to the home-bred Israelite. To him, Palestine was the very citadel of his God, built high above the western sea and the eastern desert. He lifted up his eyes to the hills from whence came his help. But here the prophet is speaking to a generation many of whom had never seen their Father's home. Forty years back, twice within the ten years the Jews had trodden the road to the Euphrates, the nation of Highlanders had been evicted and transferred to the plains, settled on the monotonous levels of Chaldæa, close to the great desert that forms the border of its fertility; they could no more sing the song of the mountain, they hung their unused harps upon the willows. This alluvial stretch, with its sultry air, lay heavy even on the imagination of the prophet, and so this second of the four supernatural voices speaks to men of the plain of God's highway in symbolism that these years of exile made most familiar. "Every mountain and hill shall be made low." The mountain is no longer the home of freedom and the haunt of God; it has become an obstacle, a barrier, a dead wall between the exile and home, something high and lifted up and threatening that blocked the way to Zion, some giant stumbling-block across God's highway for the weary, over whose overthrow the prophet sings his Hebrew *Magnificat*. Just as the valley was too low, so now is this mountain and hill too high for the Eternal who makes their road. The one must be levelled up, this other must be levelled down. First to the prophets, then to the whole nation, comes the call, breaking the night, the night of exile, with the goodness of God.

Beloved, the same mystic voices call to us, heralds no less to us of pardon for the past, of promise for the future, of God's enduring Word, or God's merciful shepherding. But all, prophets and nation, have our task set us: the way of Jehovah, the way by which God Himself shall come and lead our social exiles home, we must ourselves prepare even while we travel it. He will meet us thus, and we Him—every mountain and hill must be made low between the exiles and Zion. Still between the homeless souls and the New Jerusalem there are obstacles, barriers, stumbling-blocks, that we can best call by such names as these—Mountains of Power and Pride, and Hills of Privilege. The growth of these hills and mountains has possibly been quite natural; they have been fused in the fires of earlier social struggle and uplifted by the violent expansion of earlier social forces, or they have been laid in their historic strata by the ferment of human movement. It has all been part of the cosmic process, natural, historical, legal, only now we have outgrown our older social geology, and they have become cold and heartless barriers across the King's highway. The accumulations of idlers, the men who toil not nor spin, the women who render no personal service outside the circle of society, so-called—and there only the customary interchange of society's gifts—yet both men and women legally entitled to a first charge upon some portion of the national dividend before a single toiler, whether by brain or hand, can eat his breakfast—that must somehow be made low! The standard of common life must be so far raised that to live and die and be of no service to the community, not to give to the common life as large a return at least as one gets from it, shall be thought as base as to rob or lie. There is not an idle man in a London club, there is not a landlord who knows his tenants only through his agent, there is not a woman whose life is spent on a round of amusement, with a few hours of care for finance thrown in—not one of these that is not definitely adding to the toil and sorrow of the working world! The mere legal claim to draw dividends out of our present organisation of society to support absolute idleness is no more ethical in relation to these than the once legal right of a tax-farmer to squeeze a Roman province. The need of general freedom for the community may—I do not say must—compel us to leave some of this mountain of privilege legally unlevelled; our social tone will surely never be Christian till established and endowed idleness is as intolerable to our moral sense as any social sin. That is one mountain—the mountain of Idleness.

There is another, the mountain of Luxury. These two are the true barriers to reform; they

are the true causes of revolution. It was the sight of Versailles that maddened the Paris mob; it is the selfish luxury of the rich that gives the revolutionist his motive and justification. No doubt there is unselfishness amongst the very richest; but the wealth that parades itself, the wealth that sleeps in peace while thousands are homeless in London, the wealth that schools its own lads amongst superfluity, while it grudges the rates that shall give a training, humble yet sanitary, to the poor man's child—this wealth it is that makes all wealth suspected to the poor and the workless. If only we could recreate the age of our founders, if only our social tone could be inspired to frown upon this selfish luxury, upon the huge fortune that has piled itself out of social labour without so much as building, much less endowing, one single public benefit, if only by some Christian measure we could make impossible any but a simple standard of living! Depend upon it that in this direction lies the greatest hope of social progress. We need, if I may say so, new Christian economics of consumption; we need to stimulate in ourselves and others higher quality in our demands. The most delicate, the most artistic consumption is always the simplest, yet it is this that demands most skill, and therefore most individual labour. The education of taste in the lowest as in the highest is therefore a Christian duty, a positive contribution to future social stability of labour, and we can do nothing more akin to Christ's commands to the rich youth of the Gospel than to aim at this ideal of simple living, and devote our superfluity towards bringing it within the reach of all. It would not, after all, be very difficult to lay these two mountains low. Some of us are optimistic enough to believe that they are even being quarried already. If nothing but the idle and the luxurious were on one side and the rest of men on the other, reform would probably be sharp and swift; but it so happens that there are so many who have built for themselves upon the hill-sides of well-being, comfort, and even privilege, who are not idle and not luxurious, and while we are undermining the luxury and the idleness, it seems to them that we are threatening much that is legally their own. They are to a great extent monopolists of land or capital, legally their own, acquired by no consciously immoral means, and more out of uncertainty than of selfishness they block the way. These are mostly they who lay store by ideas of property as property, who are apt to measure the ethics of possession by mere legality, and who are sensitive to what are called their rights. They are not consciously opposed to social changes, but they are keenly aware of their own present advantages, yet they are not blind to the needs of others. They are a far more numerous class than the idlers or the merely luxurious; they are men enough to despise both, even when they see a good deal of them. Yet at present, though personally kind, they are often found amongst the forces of social opposition. I do not believe that any economic argument will greatly affect them; the only way to lay low this hill of difficulty is to present the facts quite clearly, and to appeal in the name of Christ and Humanity to their instincts of sacrifice!

Let us, then, look at some of the facts. It is stated by our chief social statistician, best known as the author of "Labour and Life of the People," that nearly forty-five per cent. of our working population and small tradespeople are dependent on parish relief after the age of sixty-five. It is not capable of proof, indeed it is not credible, that personal causes can account for such an average. Our experience tells us that forty-five per cent. of these classes are not drunken, thriftless, nor wasteful. We must look for the cause of so high an average in our system as a whole. For what does it prove? That machine industry, which has increased so vastly individual wealth, has not benefited a large section, at least, of the workers; that speculative production, made possible by the great industry, has created recurring depressions which large sections of the workers have no funds to meet. And what is more, as industry tends every day to a greater concentration, the workers, severed from capital and paid only by wages, cannot fail to find these evils intensified. Monopolies grow, trusts grow, combinations grow, one big store slowly kills down the old competing businesses, and the workers will be liable to increasing alternative pressure by over-production and by what is called depression of trade. Meanwhile, in all centres of trade and manufacture, rent continues to grow. Six shillings a week has at least to be paid by a city labourer for even two rooms, and this often out of £1 a-week wage. If a higher wage is earned, naturally more rooms are hired and more rent is paid. Yet in most cases this cannot be afforded unless the necessary food is stinted, or the necessary fire or the necessary clothes. Meanwhile, as each lease expires, rent is sure to increase; the ground landlord comes by law into property to whose value he has not often contributed the worth of ten minutes' reflection. Sixteen millions a year is paid for the right to live upon the soil of London, nearly every farthing, if not every farthing, of which value is created by the combined labour of those who pay it. And then we are surprised that these cities of the poor are crowded by the economically and morally worthless. We complacently point to their want of skill and character as if it were a sufficient explanation of our problem. We see the country side bereft of its brains and life to furnish city labour with the new vigour that it must have or die, and we deplore the effect upon the farm and the cottage, our only counter-attraction being the offer of twelve uncertain shillings per week. And as we hear the growing cry of men about us

for some greater share in the good things that they are helping to create, some greater share in leisure, culture, government, capital, even in the implements that create our wealth; as we see the dust upon the still distant highway that speaks of exiles on the move, we are persuaded to drive in our flocks and herds and entrench ourselves upon our mountains, and call them brigands, though they are our brethren in Christ, and to resolve on a struggle which is, we fondly hope, to drive them back into their land of exile. Surely Christ points us to a more excellent way.

Can this sort of thing go on? Is it likely, not to say, is it just, that the hand shall suffer the brain to say to it, "I have no need of thee?" Is it likely that the mass of men who are poor will allow parasitic life to be supported at the top, while the pauper casual has to pick oakum at the bottom? Is it likely that the exiles will come into view of Jerusalem and suffer any barrier between them and it? It is not likely! Reason and history alike tell us, for all our cry of brigands, the mountain, if it is not somehow removed by our own Christian efforts, will be mined and made low.

But is it just that these barriers should stand? It is not just! It will not seem just to us, if we be Christian men, that we should enjoy a legal immunity from economic ills. We may not even be apathetic about it; we may not even merely surrender our stronghold in a spirit of mingled fear and dislike. Ourselves with spade and pickaxe must demolish the obstacles on God's journey; we must be willing to undergo a sacrifice, we must see that the lowest is brother to the highest. Law! Law has nothing to do with it. Legal rights are not even the expression of conscience in the past, and certainly the law of yesterday does not embody the conscience of to-day. Of all we have we must ask ourselves, as in God's sight, How much can we surrender without touching the elements of the highest, simplest living? Some, indeed, will go further with Christ their Master; but if all only went as far, most of the exiles would ere long be at home! For all these exiles need is a share in the higher pleasures, in the things that help to build up character, knowledge, art, happiness, brightness, house-room for decent living, and, above all, personal service, and we can give them these; we can submit to leave individual privilege, individual power, individual wealth, that we may increase the chances of character in the community. And as we give we shall find our own characters growing with the gift. To do God's will was meat to Christ, and it will be meat to all His servants. We may have fewer hours for society if we work personally amongst the workers, time to help organise their clubs may mean less time in our own; we may put down the yacht, or give up the hunter, or let the second house, or do less of travel, or submit cheerfully to some higher taxation or loss, or, worse still, disappointment. We may not live to see the results, but we shall have seen the vision of justice, we shall have put our hand to the mining quarry of human service, and so the grave-plots that served us for our fortress on the hillside will be by our own hands built into the very fabric of God's highway.

Beloved, let us not forget that it is the highway of God. It is, after all, He that is coming to find the exile; it is not, it cannot be, His will that such suburbs as Whitechapel should go on for ever side by side with their contrasts. It cannot be a gospel for civilisation that the many should merely toil while the few reap the flowers and fruits of life. This herald voice that forms the text was uttered both to nation and to prophets; it is now uttered to our nation and to our Church. We are a Church established and endowed, our laity are the richest in the world—are we prepared to come down from the Delectable Mountain, where the air has been so soft and balmy, the enthusiasm so temperate, the outlook so serene? Are we too willing to be prophets and preach God's Gospel in the exiles' path? We are told that it is none of our business, that we do not understand mountains nor the stratification of rocks, that prophets cannot climb or quarry, or follow social geology on the heights, that our only mission is just to see that the exiles are nursed and tended, and that they keep to the road, that we should be better employed in advising them to take some other way round. But if God cared enough for social politics to bid His prophets make a way for the Jewish remnant to come home at last, and if He is the same God still; if Christ cared enough for the weary and the heavy-laden to call them to Him, and if He is the same God still; if we dare not as a church speak boldly to the mountain and confine ourselves merely to the removal of a few despicable hillocks, He surely will do without us. Neither our orders, nor our sacraments, nor our history will avail us; if we are false to them all, He will treat us as a broken cistern that holds no longer the pure water of His Gospel of Justice and Righteousness, and He will hew out for the parched travellers across the desert other cisterns which they will drink and be satisfied. God forbid!

AMONG the deaths we note that of the Rev. T. D. C. Morse, LL.D., vicar of Christ Church, Newgate Street. Dr. Morse was ordained in 1851 to the curacy of West Grimstead, Wilts, and in 1855 became rector of the parish and an inspector of schools in the diocese of Salisbury. He was rector of Stretford, Lancashire, from 1864 to 1868, and was appointed perpetual curate of St. John's, East Dulwich, and in 1876 he became vicar of Christ Church, Forest Hill. He was appointed to the vicarage of Christ Church, Newgate Street, in 1882.

UNWISE CONCEITS.

By the Rev. J. LLEWELLYN ROBERTS, M.A., Vicar of Spratton, Northamptonshire, and Hon. Canon of Peterborough.

A Ten Minutes' Sermon Preached at Spratton on January 27th, 1895.

"Be not wise in your own conceit."—Romans xii. 16.

THIS and the following verses constitute the Epistle for the day. The whole passage singularly illustrates the practical and personal character of Christianity.

These few verses would regulate the whole conduct and feeling between man and man, so that if the whole of society were consistently Christian, human life would be one of perfect harmony and peace.

But the injunctions of the Epistle, though very simple and perfectly intelligible, are nevertheless exceedingly difficult to carry out, involving an immense amount of self-control in thought and word and deed. They remind us of another Apostolic precept, "Be ye clothed with humility." How simple, but how difficult the command!

We will take this morning only the first precept. It is so plain spoken that it is almost offensive, and I feel more than half afraid to apply it to others without first assuring them that I apply it most seriously to myself.

I look back with sorrow, sometimes with amusement to the wisdom of my own self-conceit, and when I see a conceited young man walk, or hear him talk, I smile sadly and whisper to myself: Could I ever have been so conceited and ridiculous as that! I hope that years, and the experience of many mistakes, teach most of us a better wisdom than that of our own conceits.

Yet it is natural for a young man to be conceited. He is conscious of some cleverness of his own. He forgets that other people perhaps see further than himself. He is hasty in judgment, narrow in experience, lively in imagination, sanguine in hope and for the future. Such young men are to me exceedingly amusing. They are like the cockerels in a brood of chickens. Well! they will get their featherings by-and-bye, and quiet down a little; and that is the reason of an observation which I have almost uniformly made in life, namely, that a sensible man grows out of his conceit, whereas a vain man, even to old age, grows deeper and deeper into his vanity.

But though this conceit be in a measure excusable in the young, it is very foolish and leads to much evil in the elder, for there are many things which should correct a man in this respect as he grows older.

First he should grow in knowledge, and whilst growing in knowledge of other things he should be getting knowledge of himself, and there are very few things so calculated to take down a man's conceit of himself as this.

Secondly there is the knowledge that he gains, or ought to gain, of God and of His greatness, and if he be wise, the knowledge which he gathers of God's works. A wise man measuring himself, not by himself or by other men, but by these, is thereby humbled. A little knowledge puffeth up a fool, deep reflective thought humbleth the wise.

And now I will tell you why I think this so important. It is because from the conceited man God hideth Himself, whilst He revealeth Himself to the humble. How many a clever man is led astray into a fog by the wisdom of his own conceit. Therefore be not wise in your own conceit. Let your thoughts be as deep as you will, but keep them lowly if you would catch a ray of divine truth. And in the study of divine wisdom remember the caution, "He is in Heaven, thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few." Depend upon it very great truths are revealed to the soul that is both humble and devout.

Let me now mention one or two causes of this foolish wisdom of our own conceits. You will perhaps remember David's words, though they were not uttered in this connection: "With the flatterer," said the royal Psalmist, "were busy mockers." I do not refer to designing or ill-intentioned flatterers; but sometimes flatterers who mean no harm do much mischief.

Among these I include our parents and dearest friends. Oh, a mother's love is a dangerous flatterer, and by its sweet deceptions nourishes a youth's conceit. I would be very tender with a mother's love; it is so beautiful, so unselfish, but it is often very unwise, and as we say, spoils a child. Therefore it is often well for him to go away from home into the more bracing atmosphere of school or work, and have the unwisdom of his own conceit taken down.

The most dangerous flatterers are those who surround the great or the beautiful in the days of their inexperience. They say that there is a fierce light which beats upon a throne. True! but it shows the occupant of the throne to everybody but himself.

I wonder whether I shall give offence if I mention a class of flatterers who often do much evil and cause great mischief in this matter, and who harm persons of both sexes. The strange fact is that whilst these flatter in youth *they are very busy mockers in age*. Those to which I refer are the looking-glasses with which we surround ourselves. Seriously, personal vanity plays a great part, however silly in "the wisdom of our own conceit," and it is lamentable to see how often it will cover even able men with ridicule and beautiful women with contempt. Science itself yields itself to the flatterer's art, and the very rays of the sun are constrained to produce a portrait which shall have less of art than of artifice.

The last point to which I call your attention is the connection in which the passage stands. This injunction stands as a preliminary to the gravest summary of our duty toward mankind. This modest estimate of ourselves, this calm just estimate of our own powers, this true and wise estimate of our opinions is not only certain to save us from innumerable follies but often from grievous wrong.

It is quite true that we are bound to have some confidence in our own judgment, some dependence upon our own opinions, and in the matter of our faith we are bound to have a reason for the hope that is in us; but this confidence must rest not upon the airy wisdom of our own conceits, but upon serious thought, upon calm reflection, upon a readiness to learn, upon a humble desire to be taught of God. This is the spirit which possesses the power, almost indeed divine, to overcome evil with good. (Rom. xii. 21.)

THE late Dr. Dale was in the diocese of the Bishop of Worcester, though he was what Dean Stanley called a nonconforming member of the National Church, and Dr. Perowne sent word that he would have attended the funeral if he had been well enough to do so. As it was, he sent a wreath to be placed on the coffin.

NOW that the Rev. the Hon. W. B. Ponsonby has become Earl of Bessborough, there are four temporal peers in Holy Orders. The others are the Marquis of Normanby, Canon of St. George's, Windsor; Lord Scarsdale, Rector of Kedleston; and Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin.

DR. ALICE MARSTON, who has just returned from Pekin, gave a graphic account the other day at the S.P.C.K. house of her work in the Chinese capital. According to a report in the *Record*, she said that, although in Pekin itself there were a large number of medical missionaries, in the surrounding villages they were deeply needed. The Chinese doctors were of no use at all, and the people, when they had overcome their prejudices, were most willing and anxious for her and the other medical missionaries to do all in their power to heal their diseases. She also mentioned that when the natives came to her dispensary for medical advice, they were always given a little religious instruction, sometimes by herself, and sometimes by her native assistants.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Water for the Thirsty. "Ho, every one that thirsteth" (Isaiah lv. 1). Introduction.—The inexpressible blessings of the Gospel of Christ are most beautifully pourtrayed in glowing phraseology by the prophet. No one can read the text we have selected and not feel impressed with its suitability and adaptation to man. We notice three things in our text. We shall put them as three important questions in connection with our text:—i. Are you thirsty? "Come" (John iv. 14). ii. Are you without money? "Come" (Rev. xxi. 6). iii. Are you now ready? "Come" (Luke xiv. 17). Let us learn—1. That we refuse not the Gospel feast. 2. You may have forgiveness of sins: you are bidden to come now. 3. There is nothing to satisfy the soul but the milk of the blessed Gospel of Christ. 4. All are welcome, all are free. Come now. Do not refuse Him that speaketh.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper shoul be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1895.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION TO THE FORE.

THE question of religious instruction in Elementary Schools still presses to the front, and is assuming the position of a political problem of first-class importance. For this we have to thank Mr. Acland. His policy at the Education Department has been severely criticised; he has been openly charged with deliberately working to the prejudice of the Church Schools. And there is no doubt that in certain cases Church Schools have been hardly treated by comparison with former years. But, in our opinion, this has been all for the best. Certainly Church people should be the last persons in the world to desire the continuance of an easy administration, which suffered their schools to fall short of modern requirements. Many of them did. The buildings were old, the fittings obsolete, they were tolerated for some time for various reasons, but that could not go on for ever, and the present administration decided that the time had come for levelling up the Church Schools to the technical requirements of the Code. This entailed trouble and anxiety and responsibility upon managers; in almost all cases it was a difficult task to satisfy the demands of the Department within the time allowed, in a few it has proved impossible. And it is not to be wondered at that Church people, harassed and anxious, struggling with unforeseen difficulties, should have thought themselves unfairly treated.

But the results are turning out well for the Church. There is first the removal of the common taunt that Church Schools were of an inferior type, starved in equipment and teaching power. From this time forward all Church Schools will be above

reproach, having satisfied the very letter of the law. And there is the signal proof of the tremendous hold which the Church Schools have upon the nation. Their need has excited remarkable enthusiasm and generosity. In hardly an instance has the appeal for help failed to bring an adequate response. All over England money has been freely raised and spent in restoring and re-equipping schools found deficient according to modern standards. It is plain that the people still value Church privileges, and are not disposed to part with them in return for the curious theological hotch-potch which goes by the name of undenominationalism, and forms the staple of the religious teaching in up-to-date Board Schools. In fact, we can see now what the promoters of the Acts of 1871 failed to see, that the Church Schools are a permanent feature in education. The "Compromise" was never intended to meet this. It was arrived at under a general impression that the Board Schools would soon eat up the Church Schools; and it was based upon the hypothesis that, after eliminating the characteristic doctrines of every religious body, a residuum of Christian teaching would be easily discovered which might be taught impartially. These two premisses are now shown to be false. The history of the Church Schools during the last two years shows that the majority of the nation are bent upon combining religious with secular instruction, and that if one class of schools eats up the other, the Board Schools, rather than the Church Schools, will be eaten. The "residuum" theory has broken down. Under the compromise the nature of religious instruction given evidently depends upon the personal inclination of the teacher. It need not be Christian at all, a teacher may even expressly disclaim any intention of teaching pure Christianity, as has just happened in London, and yet find members of his School Board willing to continue him in the religious part of his duties. The working effect of the Compromise is merely negation, it secures that a child shall not be taught certain doctrines to which his parents object, but that is all.

There remains a worse defect in the present system. It makes absolutely no provision for the legitimate demand of parents to have their children given the religious instruction they desire. All but an infinitesimal part of the nation is Christian, of some denomination, and it is natural to suppose that most want their children taught after their own way. This must be done either in school or out of it. If out of it, then we get absolutely secular education, which has hardly a voice raised in its favour. Not a single Secularist had a chance in the London elections. If in school, how? And how about the compromise, which excludes all denominational teaching? At present we have this anomaly in a free and Christian country, that no Christian parent can have his child instructed as he likes in the schools he pays for. Oddly enough this liberty has been secured for the Jews, who have been allowed to make arrangements with the School Boards perfectly satisfactory to themselves. So, no doubt, would Mohammedans and Buddhists, if they were in this country in sufficient numbers.

The only excuse for this absurd and anomalous state of things is that its promoters, as we have intimated, never meant it to last. They expected the problem to find its solution in a particular way. They were mistaken. The time is fast approaching, however, when some solution must be found, and that seems to be becoming evident, even to some of our statesmen. The public actions of politicians are a sort of barometer, and when ex- and future Premiers and front-rank Cabinet Ministers begin to handle a subject upon the platform, it is a sure sign that it will soon be heard of at the polls. The question of religious instruction bids fair shortly to take the place of the Newcastle Programme in public interest. It is earnestly to be hoped that it will be dealt with in a purer and less partizan spirit.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE trouble that has arisen in the City parish of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, presents our patronage system in its least attractive light. The late rector was the Rev. S. Flood Jones, but practically the parish has been for several years in the sole charge of Mr. Henrey, as curate, and there can be no doubt that he has won the universal esteem of the parishoners by his zealous and efficient labours. They are naturally distressed that he has not been appointed to the living, which is in the gift of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, and a very unpleasant feeling has been created by the nomination of the Rev. H. R. Gamble by Canon Duckworth, whose turn it was to present. It seems that Mr. Gamble's first act on receiving the nomination was to give notice to Mr. Henrey that his services would not be further required, and the parish is in a blaze of indignation.

Nobody, of course, is to blame. Canon Duckworth was within his right in nominating a gentleman who had been his own curate, and there is no suggestion that he is unfit for the post. Mr. Gamble can no more be censured for accepting the benefice than the patron for offering it. Nevertheless, it is much to be wished that a way could be found out of the difficulty. In a general way, it is not desirable to recognise the prescriptive right of a clergyman in sole charge, who has done his duty exceptionally well, to succeed his vicar or rector in the event of retirement or death, but circumstances alter cases. In the present instance it would, we think, be a graceful act on the part of Mr. Gamble to withdraw his acceptance, though nobody has a right to ask him to do so, and we cannot but believe that such an act of self-abnegation for the sake of the Church would be remembered to his advantage by episcopal or other dispensers of patronage.

The report of the East London Church Fund is encouraging, though its work has been crippled by

want of adequate subscriptions, and hindered by the long illness of the Bishop of Bedford. The Council of the Fund say that they are thankful to observe many signs of progress in the life of the Church in the East London district. As one instance out of many, a parish may be mentioned which the Council supplies with grants for a second curate and two deaconesses; here seven years ago there was nothing but an iron church, very thinly attended, a small Sunday School, and, in a population of 6,000, less than forty communicants on Easter Day. Now a church and parish room have been built, a well-organised mission-house for deaconesses has been established, there are large congregations, the Sunday Schools contain over a thousand children, and last Easter Day there were 643 communicants.

Ordinary parish work is, however, supplemented by special efforts in various places, and the Council particularly mention a series of services for men, organised in a very poor North London parish, which receives a grant from the fund. The services are held on Sunday afternoons, and the results have been most gratifying. "Between five and six hundred men, mounting up to seven, eight, and even ten hundred on special occasions, are found habitually in church, scores of whom had not entered a place of worship for years. The attendance at the evening service has largely increased, many men bringing their wives and families. Sunday drinking has decreased fully one-third, and thrift and providence are increasing on every hand"; with more to a like effect.

A clergyman well known in London over the Border recently died. The Rev. J. A. McAllister had been vicar of the parish church of St. Margaret's, Plumstead (the Woolwich Arsenal Church), for more than 30 years, and had reached an advanced age. He was able to officiate as recently as the 10th of the present month, but the end came on the 20th inst. Mr. McAllister was an old-fashioned Evangelical, and could never be persuaded to discard the black gown in the pulpit. The appointment of his successor rests with the Rev. R. Irwin, a clergyman resident in Ireland.

The new Bishop of Adelaide, in succession to Dr. Kennion, now Bishop of Bath and Wells, is the Rev. John Reginald Harmer. Mr. Harmer, who was educated at Eton, and subsequently became a scholar of King's College, Cambridge, is in his 37th year. From 1883 to 1889 he was a Fellow of King's, and since 1890 has held a fellowship of Corpus Christi, of which society he is at present dean and tutor. Mr. Harmer, who was ordained deacon in 1883 and priest in the following year by the late Bishop of Durham, was licensed to the curacy of Monkwearmouth. From 1884 till the time of his death he was domestic chaplain to Bishop Lightfoot, and became his literary executor and the editor of his posthumous works. He is one of Bishop Westcott's examining chaplains. The selection was made by the Archbishop of Canterbury and and the Bishops of Manchester, Wakefield, and Bath and Wells, with Bishop Selwyn, and it is stated that their choice was unanimous.

With regard to recent rumours from Rome, the *Tablet* says in its issue of the 23rd inst.:—"We have the highest authority for saying that no proposal for the abolition of the law requiring the celibacy of the clergy has at any time been brought before the Pope; that the question has not even been mooted in Rome; that the idea of such a change as the abolition of the law of celibacy in the case of the secular clergy would not be entertained by the Holy See for a moment; that it is absolutely untrue to say that Leo XIII. personally would approve of such a change." This may be taken, we suppose, to mean that nothing will be done in the matter at present.

The Church Congress has become an institution in Ireland as well as in England. The place of meeting this year is Londonderry, and the date is September 9th, the meetings being continued on the three following days. The opening sermons will be preached by the Bishop of Ripon and the Rev. H. C. G. Moule. Among English clergymen and laymen who have promised to attend the Congress as readers of papers or selected speakers are the Bishop of Chester, Professors Ryle and Sayce, the Headmaster of Harrow Archdeacon Gore, Canons Tristram, Fletcher, Knox-Little, and Mason, Prebendary Eyton, the Rev. R. R. Dolling, Earl Nelson, Mr. F. Sherlock, and others.

A South London correspondent draws our attention to the fact that the requirements of the season are not overlooked in that part of the town any more than in the City or the fashionable West. At St. Mark's, Kennington, they are giving a series of Lenten services on alternate Wednesday evenings, consisting of Stainer's "Crucifixion" and Gounod's "Mors et Vita," the latter with full orchestral accompaniment. The "Crucifixion" is to be repeated on Good Friday afternoon.

EXISTENCE AS A NOTE OF INTERROGATION; WITH THE GENERAL ANSWER.

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture at the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham Street, E.C., at 1.15 p.m. on Wednesday last, stated:—

Processes and movements are photographed which occur within the three-hundredth part of a second. With like accuracy we observe and record nature's grandest works and movements. By this minuteness and comprehensiveness it is discovered that physical nature, in its order and deviations, suspenses and advances, agreements and oppositions, is without error and confusion everywhere. The atom is adjusted to the universe, and the universe to the atom.

How is it, then, there is such great turmoil in the material world, and not less suffering amongst living creatures? If there is one almighty wise and good God, why is the evil not prevented? or how can it be cured? The cure is faith in God.

By what we ourselves know and do as to nature, we alleviate pain, turn aside disasters, heal many diseases. By trust in the word and work of our fellow-men, we at home enlarge every sort of knowledge, and become benefactors to mankind. If this trust in man accompanied the greater and better part, faith in God, our capacity as replenishers of nature and human helpers would be marvellously increased.

Will faith explain mysteries, take away evil, and bring good?

Certainly. Trust in man gives use to geography and the "Nautical Almanac." If we did not use faith as to man, we should be woefully ignorant. Science, built up by many earnest workers, is formulated in their departments; and we find, as the greatest modern discovery, that nature, in the small and great, the near and far-off, is the manifestation of an Eternal Power. It matters not whether we speak of the influence as an internal principle or as by external flux coming

within. The Power is not nature's own, but that by which nature exists. This Power, making, sustaining, guiding all, is leading to an issue more wonderful than the process, as being the crown of it. By the beauty of order, the progressive bettering, the union of wisdom and power, there is continually a rectification of disorder, renewal of strength, and reproduction of life. The carrying on ever and ever to the future, by universal co-operation of all and a pervading adaptation of everything, is that answer to our interrogation by which we know that things temporal lead to the eternal, and that all evil will in due time pass away, because the Eternal is not less wise than mighty, and not less loving than able to take away all pain and make all things new.

THE CONTINUITY OF POSSESSION AT THE REFORMATION.

By the Rev. G. F. BROWNE, B.D., Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, and Disney Professor of Archæology at Cambridge University.

Delivered in St. Michael's, Cornhill, being one of a Course of Lectures referring to Disestablishment, Monday, February 4th, 1895.

Many of you remember the words of the Bishop of London last Monday, that the Christian clergy are ambassadors for Christ. I am here to-day as a lecturer on Church history, and as such I speak. I feel profoundly convinced of the truth of the Bishop's saying that this character of an ambassador for Christ must be stamped upon the public utterances of the clergy, whether they be lectures or sermons. My business here to-day is to speak of the continuity of the National Christian Church of the English, a continuity which has existed now for close on thirteen hundred years. That surely is no inappropriate subject for an ambassador of Christ. Continuity of possession is the definition of my subject. Possession seems to suggest property, but I mean much more than possession in that sense. The proudest and best possession of the English Church is that it is the national Church of the English. Let me say something on that point first, and then something on possession in the material sense.

"Continuity of Possession at the Reformation" is the full title of my subject. Our thoughts are specially turned to the Reformation period. In the good old times, as people who do not know the lessons of history are wont to call them, when the Christian Church in the West was supposed to be what in fact the Christian Church has never been, and, as far as man sees, never can be, all at one, men used language which later controversies, if they had known of them, would have prevented their using. But making every allowance of this or any other kind, you never can get over the fact—and I am the last person who would wish to get over the fact—that our Church from the first was called the Church of the English and nothing else. Not at first the Church of England, but the Church of the English, thus leaving room for a world-wide expansion, and that, too, time after time, by the Bishops of Rome, from one of whom the missionaries came who made us Christians. It was so in the year 600. Pope Gregory, our founder, regularly calls us the Church of the English. If I were speaking to a class of historical students, I should feel it unnecessary to say that of course he never uses any such impossible phrase as the Church of Rome in England, or the Roman Church in England, or the Roman Catholic Church, in speaking of us. Of his own Church, when he wishes to speak of it, he speaks naturally as the Roman Church; of our Church he speaks as the Church of the English; of the Church in France he speaks as the Church of the Gauls, and he says, "Collect what you find to be the best, whether in the Roman Church, or in the Church of the Gauls, or in any other Church."

It was so in 747. The English Church then declared, contrary to advice from abroad, that whatever difficult questions might arise in the conduct and government and management of the National Church, they should be brought before the synod of the Church and there settled by our Archbishop. The advice they got from abroad was that they should go on to say, "And what is too difficult for the Archbishop shall be sent to the Pope to be settled." This was in 747. But they said nothing of the sort; they were a self-contained National Church, a Church of the English, not a mere branch of the Roman Church settled in England, and so they determined to settle finally their own most difficult concerns. Those were not as yet controversial days, so the clear declaration of the English instinct is all the more valuable. They were also days when the English Church did not include the more ancient British Church.

And when you come to the controversial days, days when the English Church had come to include the more ancient British Church, that is the Church of Wales, as one with itself, you will see the same thing emphasized, emphatic. Pope Paschal in 1115 sent a bitter complaint that the English Church was so exceedingly independent. He set forth the points of this independence—they are priceless to us. The English Church, we know, regulated its own affairs without foreign intervention; the English bishops promised obedience to the English archbishops, reserving none for the Pope. The English archbishops convened the provincial synods, the Crown convened the national synods, without asking the Pope's permission. There was no appeal, the law said, from the national synod of the English. The letters and decrees of the Popes had no validity in England unless they had been approved by the English king. That was his complaint. If the English, he roundly declared, persist in that independence, I will shake off the dust of my feet against them—exactly what we should have been rejoiced at, but exactly what he did not do. It was not the Roman Catholic Church he complained of, it was our English Church—that was its name, that was its nature. Pope Paschal would have had it conduct itself as a branch of the Roman Catholic Church; it flatly refused; it was the National Church, an independent Church, an autonomous Church, the Church of the English.

It was so in 1367. Here you come to the centre of controversial times, when the English Church and the English nation declared that the Pope must be resisted with all the power of the realm. That is long and long, you see, nearly two centuries, before the English Reformation. And the nation promised the Church that the bishops should be protected in carrying out this great national resolve. It was the English Church and nothing else. The efforts of the Popes to

make it otherwise had roused its wrath. They reverenced the Pope as the head of the greatest see of the West, as I personally do; as the bishop to whom all the other bishops of the West might look—alas, they found at times the vilest of all vile examples of human frailty; they reverenced the idea of the Pope, and the Pope himself, when he was worthy of it. But this realm of England had but one attitude when the national independence was really threatened, and that attitude was this—the Pope must be resisted with all the power of the realm.

It was so in 1533, in that great Act of Henry VIII. against appeals to Rome—his realm of England is an Empire, this crown of England is an imperial crown, the English Church can manage its own affairs. It was expressly so in 1535, in the great Act of Supremacy, for Henry VIII. and his advisers knew well their historical strength. There it was declared that the Sovereign is rightly the only supreme head on earth of the Church in England, called *Anglicana ecclesia;* clearly keeping the old name, the name it had always been called by, to show as it were, not to that generation, for they knew it well, but to all future generations, that the Church was what it had always been, that there was nothing new, it was the old Church continued. Just as Richard II., 150 years before, had declared through Parliament that the Crown of England was under subjection to no one on earth, but was under subjection to God alone.

All this was before there was any question of the Church reconsidering its doctrinal belief; there was no break whatever in that respect; the word "Reformation" had never been heard. The only thing that had been done was to declare that, as in the past, the English Church had managed its own affairs without the dominion of any foreign Power—Pope Paschal told us it was so—so it would for the present and for the future, the ridiculous usurpations of the Pope being puffed away, when the nation really rose in earnest, like so much thistle-down. They soon became aware that a great deal more than papal usurpations had grown upon our Church, doctrines and usages that would not bear the light of day, which were superimposed upon the faith of the Apostles and the faith of the English. All Europe was finding out the same thing in that century—not Germany only, but France; not France only, but Rome. The Roman Church went through a very much more prolonged period of agony, so to speak, considering all its doctrines over again at the Council of Trent, than the English Church ever found it necessary to do. They came to one conclusion, we came to another, but they revised all their doctrines just as much as we did all ours. We in England determined to have our services in our own language, a language we could understand, as all men had at first. The Jewish Christians, the Syrian Christians, the Greek Christians, all had the Scriptures, all had the Church worship, as a matter of course in their own tongue. Latin came a good deal later, but it came as soon as it was wanted, and only because it was wanted. It came only because it was the language which the people that used it understood, and they determined to have their services and the Word of God in their own vernacular just as all other nations did. And then these Latin Scriptures, Latin services, the latest of all, the furthest removed of all from the holy originals, must forsooth be stereotyped to the end of the world as the one language in which all those who called themselves Catholics must read of God and must worship Him! We swept away all that folly. Around the central point of Christian worship, Christian strength, and Christian life, there had grown up the grossest superstition. We retained in full the central point of Christian worship, Christian strength, and Christian life, but we swept away the superstition. Between man and his Maker had been interposed one who was said to have power on earth to remit a larger or a smaller portion of the penalties of sin after death; the Pope claimed that he could rescue souls from the purgatorial fire between death and judgment, and, claiming to have that awful power, he would not do it unless he was well paid for it. We swept it and him away. It had come to be believed that, unless the Pope pleased to send to our Archbishop of Canterbury a little ornamental collar of white wool, with some pretty red things upon it, to wear, the Archbishop could not consecrate bishops, and the Episcopal succession in England must cease. We did without the collar, and we kept up the Episcopal succession. Did all that make us cease to be the English Church, the National Church of England? No! It made us more than ever truly so. We had swept away all the foreign encroachments that had imperilled the truth of the phrase, "English Church," "National Church"; we had swept away all the things that had imperilled the truth of the phrase, "Catholic Church"; and fully and for ever we were, we are, the English Church—the English Catholic Church.

Nothing can deprive us of that except our own folly. Disestablishment may come—we are still the Church of England; Disendowment may drive us to make our bricks without the supply of straw—we are still the Catholic Church of Christ in this English land.

And now as to endowments. We can put our fingers straight upon the beginning of the property of the Church. Ethelbert, whose conversion we are to commemorate in 1897, built and set going the three great cathedral churches—Canterbury, London, and Rochester, from 602 to 604. There were then no churches at all outside those places, and the Bishop and his clergy and staff lived in the central place, and went out into the country to preach and convert. Ethelbert, Bede tells us, gave in each case property to the Bishop, and gave also prophets to those with him—that is, he endowed the bishopric, as we should say—and he provided maintenance for the Christian clergy and for Christian teaching in the diocese. That is a simple and a true statement, which no one can question. As things advanced and teachers were settled permanently here and there in the country, special portions of the general property of the diocese were allotted to them, and in time good men gave local portions to augment them. Ethelbert, in the one charter which is accepted as genuine, states that the land he gives is his own land, it is not the land of the people, it is not land given by the nation—"a portion"—he calls it, modestly, a small portion—"a small portion of my land." And he hopes that other individuals will in time augment this his endowment. And he is so anxious against alienation, or any question of title, that he signs the charter, and has it signed and supported by all the chief people of the land. We at St. Paul's still hold an estate in Essex, which he gave us about the year 609, to maintain the fabric of the Cathedral Church; we hold it still, the only part of our landed estates that has not been vested in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and I have not heard the title questioned. No one ever said to us in Henry VIII.'s time that we had cast

away the Pope, a foreign and usurping power, and therefore our title to this manor was voided; nor in Edward VI.'s time that we said our prayers in English, and therefore our title was voided; nor that we did not believe in purgatory and transubstantiation, and so our title was voided; nor in Elizabeth's time, that we had not the collar, and the title was voided. If it is voided, it must have been voided at some particular time; which particular time was it? The fact is, the property was not given under any such condition. It was given at a time when transubstantiation had never been heard of—the idea that at consecration the bread and wine cease to have any of the substance of bread and wine, and have only the substance of the Body and Blood of our Lord, had not even been invented then; it was not invented for long after that, and then it was explicitly denied on behalf of the Church of England. It was centuries after it was invented before it was accepted as of the faith, even by Rome. It had only been a part of the avowed belief of the Church of England about 260 years when the Reformation came. The true statement is, that our title to this manor was so good that it took care of itself. Henry never said, Edward never said, Elizabeth never said, "We have changed so much, your title may perhaps be questioned. Therefore, by the authority of Parliament, it is declared that you shall not be deemed to have forfeited your title." Nothing of the kind was ever dreamed of. We are told in these days that the property was taken from us to be given, not to others, but to ourselves; that the property was taken from the old Church and given to the new. If there was a new and an old, we were both. One in high position has said: "If all had their rights, it belongs to those from whom it was taken—the Roman Catholics." But of these ideas of an old Church and a new, nothing whatever was mentioned. The idea of an old Church and the idea of a new Church never appears in any Act of Parliament, in any document whatever of anybody. Our succession to this manor went on unbroken. The convocations of the Church made such changes as the times required—made, by the way, in our own Chapter House at St. Paul's, as it happened—and no change that they made had the least effect upon the tenants of the manors. They were not told to cease to pay to such and such a man, and pay to such and such another. The owners were the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, and to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's they paid. There is one thing certain. If our title was voided at any point of the Reformation, we can show no Act of Parliament restoring it; but then there is another thing quite certain, too, that no Act of Parliament, no document, can be shown voiding it.

Let us glance again at earlier times, in order to lead up to a more general statement. A central endowment was given by one king and another, one great man and another, of the English Heptarchy for the expenses of teaching Christianity and keeping it alive. About 735 Bede wrote to the Archbishop of York to advise the Bishops that they ought not to keep too large a part of the endowment of their own diocese; they should keep only so much as properly belonged to the part they themselves could properly do of the work. Where they could not do the work properly themselves, they should assign the work and a proportion of the income to those who did it. And Bede tells us that far too much property had been given, quite apart from and besides this diocesan property, for founding monasteries, many of which were already noted as places of idleness and dissipation. Here we have two distinct objects of gift, two distinct kinds of property—one object, the maintenance of the service of God throughout the country, with all the care of the sick, the afflicted, and the young, which went with it—that is one; the other, the maintenance of a large body of men and women living a life of isolation, gone out of the world; and already, in Bede's time, 1,160 years ago, there were noticeable evils in the monastic establishments. On the eve of the Norman Conquest—still more, of course, after the Conquest—the Norman holders of property in England attached a large number of the monasteries of England to abbeys in France, and all the income of these monasteries, whether in money or in kind, not used on the spot, went to France. When the great French wars of Henry V. broke out, these attached alien priories, because they belonged to alien bodies on the Continent, were a source of income to the enemy—the French. Parliament was called in, and their estates were taken by the King. That took place long before the Reformation; they were not taken from one Church and given to another; they were taken away entirely and given to secular purposes, to persons every one of whom held the old, unreformed doctrines. Then Wolsey came. He wanted to found a great college. There was no idea, no whisper of a change in Church matters, but he got the land of a number of the monastic institutions, which were to be suppressed, and their property was to be used. He and all about him were staunch upholders of the old, unreformed doctrines. Then came the great spoliation of the monasteries in Henry VIII.'s time; their property was taken clean away, not to be given to a new Church, there was no idea of a new Church, there was no such thing; the people who took away the property were still upholders of the old, unreformed doctrine, there had been no reformation of doctrine at all. The same Parliament that made the final sweep of the monasteries passed the tremendous Act for putting to death every one who did not believe in transubstantiation, and declared all the goods forfeited of everyone who did not believe in auricular confession, celibacy of the clergy, and so on. If people will have it that the mediæval Church of England was what they call Roman Catholic, then it was Roman Catholics who took away all that enormous mass of property, and such part of it as the King himself did not secure or keep, Roman Catholics—if you will call them so—got, and some is held by modern Roman Catholics still. It was after all this was finally accomplished, absolutely done, that the reformation in doctrine began—some seven years afterwards. After the great act of spoliation of the monasteries the change in doctrine began; it was carried out by the clergy and the laity, but at no one point of the process can you lay your hand upon the actors in it and say, "Yesterday was the old Church, to-day it is new." That time never comes; the change is gradual. Both sides, of course, when they got the upper hand, were tyrannical—it was the way in those times; where we turn out a Minister, they cut off his head. The main body never changed, any more than a change of Ministry in London—though this is a weak simile—changes the great mass of the men in all the Government offices, by whom the real government is carried on. And that simile is a certain exaggeration. There was no step anything like as great as the country turning out one Government this year, or next, say, and putting in another.

Of course, if anything of the nature of taking away property from the old Church and giving it to the new Church had been perpetrated by Henry VIII. or Edward VI., the very first act of Queen Mary would have been to hand it all over again to the old Church, and reinstate the old Church. This consideration is very important. So much alive to the difficulties of the position were Queen Mary and her advisers thatf when they abolished the title of Supreme Head of the Church, in England, they had to pass an Act declaring that all Henry's documents were valid which so described him, although they hated the title, and they had to pass an Act besides, declaring that Queen Mary's documents should be valid, although they did not describe her as Supreme Head of the Church of England. But from first to last not a word about reinstating the old Church, about taking anything away from the new Church and giving it back to the old. No mention of an old Church and a new.

On the contrary—and this is an important fact—the clergy, the same clergy in the bulk, mind you, as those under Edward VI., were made to petition Queen Mary that the property taken away in Roman Catholic times (if you will call them so; I do not) under Henry VIII., and in reformed times under Edward VI., and put in secular hands, entirely diverted from religious purposes, might not be restored to the Church. They were made to say they preferred the peace of the land to their own profit. In fact, they could not have restored the old doctrines unless it had been made quite sure that the people who had fattened on the plunder of the monasteries should not be obliged to disgorge. Cardinal Pole came over with a dispensation from the Pope, and this dispensation was ratified by Act of Parliament, authorising all—call them Roman Catholics, if you will; I call them English Catholics—authorising all Roman Catholics—that is, all members of the unreformed Church of England—to hold all the plunder of the Church which they had got by gift, or by purchase, or in any other way. The list of ways in which they may have got it is absolutely exhausted, so as to make it perfectly safe. Thus the Pope specially legalised the whole of Henry VIII.'s spoliation—spoliation, remember, before the Reformation; spoliation by a Roman Catholic in faith, Henry VIII., if ever there was one.

And this goes very deep. I have pointed out to you that there were two kinds of property for religious purposes—that which endowed the worship of God throughout the diocese—viz., tithes, glebe land, and so on—and that which endowed the monasteries. So far as these remained separate, it may be said, roughly, but with lamentable exceptions in detail, that the spoliation left the former kind, tithes, glebe land, and so on, untouched; but with regard to the monastic property, swept the whole away. But that was only so far as they were kept separate; they had long ceased to be separate, and this is the point I want you to fasten yourselves upon just now. The patrons of country benefices, for instance, the owners, as we should say, of rectorial advowsons, wishing to endow some monastery or other, with the Bishop's consent, gave to it the rectorial advowsons which were their property, and at the next vacancy the monastery took the tithes, took the glebe land and the rest of the property, and kept it, and paid a vicar so much a year—a small amount usually — to do the duty. At the various plunderings of the monasteries this part of their property was taken away and used for secular purposes—given to laymen and so on—and this was the property of the Church kind, and not property of the monastic kind. Surely, you will say, Queen Mary, surely Cardinal Pole, surely the Pope, would have this property of the Church restored to the Church, while the purely monastic property might remain with the lay people who had got it. But no! It was expressly declared—and the Act is one of extreme interest—by the Pope, by Cardinal Pole, by Queen Mary, and by Parliament, that tithes — I am quoting the words — that "tithes, glebe lands, or other ecclesiastical or spiritual property" which had got into the hands of laymen, shall continue in the hands of those who had got it. And to this day plenty of Roman Catholic laymen hold property of the Church, specially guaranteed to them by the Pope; while they venture to talk of the sacrilegious plunder of sacred things, and in defiance of dates and history put it down to the discredit of the Reformation. Yes; and you hear of Queen Elizabeth ordering the Church plate to be melted down to provide money—it was Queen Mary, if you please, who melted Church plate. There was absolutely unbroken possession of the plunder of the Church by these gentry, who got tithes and glebes with the Pope's guarantee; there has been unbroken possession of the property so taken and so given. And there has been an absolutely unbroken possession of the remnant that was left in the possession of the clergy of the old Church that flourishes still without any break or joint in its harness, flourishes still among us, the old Church ever-renewing itself, a continuous succession from the early Anglo-Saxons to the present moment, both of the Church as the English Church, and of the property it holds for the purposes of God. Through the Norman Conquest, through Henry VIII.'s times, through Edward's VI.'s, through Mary's, through Elizabeth's, the Church and its means for good, means sadly shorn by King and Pope, have abided. May no man rise up to do for the remnant what King and Pope did for the rest! May the Church of England flourish as long as England, as long as the world, lasts!

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

SIR,—I desire to apologise to Mr. Sandlands for any rudeness whereof I have been guilty, while I have no idea what the rudeness consists in. Your correspondent propounds to me what he calls dilemmas. If the Church, he asks, dates only from the Day of Pentecost, what of the Old Testament saints? There is no dilemma. The Old Testament saints were not members of a Church that had no existence in their time. Our Lord said to St. Peter, "Upon this Rock I will build My Church," not "I have built." The Church was not built nor founded till at or after His Ascension.

Next, as for the Church of Christ being a society, in the same manner and after the same kind that the Hebrew nation was a society, the only allusion that is recorded, which our Lord made to His Church and its nature, treats of it as of a political human society. It is so spoken of also throughout its history in the book

of Acts, and is so spoken of throughout the Apostolic Epistles.

The Church of Christ, like all human societies, has its good and its bad members. I am of the belief that the kingdom of heaven, in the parables of Matthew xiii.—at least in four out of the seven—means the Church; but whether or not, the kingdom of heaven is not less holy than the Church is; and the kingdom of heaven, for its members and subjects, in the parable of the wheat and the tares, in the parable of the hidden leaven, and in the concluding parable of the net, has both bad and good. The Queen of England has loyal subjects and disloyal; but both sorts are alike her subjects, and can cease to be her subjects only by voluntarily transferring their allegiance to another power and removing to that other power's jurisdiction. So, I suppose, a member of Christ's Church can cut himself off from it by becoming consciously and openly a servant of Satan, when, perhaps, he would lose the power of returning to his lawful King. But the mere captives of Satan have not ceased to be God's children, which they are through their adoption by Him in holy baptism. Simon Magus believed and was baptised; he sinned grossly, but he did not cease to be in the covenant by his violation of it. St. Peter did not cast him out of the Church, but reproved him and exhorted him to repentance, if haply he might find it.

I cannot follow Mr. Sandlands into what he says of baptism, when he tells me that I do not "understand by baptism what ought to be understood by it." I apprehend that everybody in a Christian country knows what baptism is. I do not say that everybody in a Christian country knows all that baptism signifies; indeed, to judge by your correspondent's language, I must doubt if he does. He thinks that Acts ii. 41 is an obscure passage, and to make it *easy and clear* he gives two alternative explanations of it directly inconsistent with each other.

Mr. Sandlands is, I understand, the priest of a parish, and it is his duty to baptise the infants born there, and to teach the young persons living there the Catechism. Our baptismal services and our Catechism are direct contradictions in almost their every expression, and entirely in the whole matter of their teaching, to these misty and unscriptural notions of the Church and of the Sacrament of Baptism. I am unable to understand, I say, not so much the consistency, as the moral and mental sanity of a man who, when he baptises a child on Sunday, pronounces it "regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church," and on Monday writes to you to say that the Church is not the Church, but something else, and that baptism does not mean baptism.

It is scarcely worth while to take up your space with a remark on the last clause of Mr. Sandland's letter, wherein he tells me that to cite general Church opinion is no argument, his whole letter being as devoid of argument as anything I ever read. To cite general Church opinion may be no argument to prove a proposition; but it is an overwhelming argument to prove that the person who cites it as in his favour is not singular in what he thanks, and so I used it. I will use the same argument now further. The Universal Church, according to general tradition, and the Church of England, according to its formularies, think concerning the Church and baptism as I have endeavoured to indicate.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

March 20th.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." March, 1895. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

THE "Notes of Recent Exposition" contain, as usual, much information very brightly and clearly put. The account of Professor Harnach's change of front as regards the date of the Gospel of Peter, leaving the author of "Supernatural Religion" in solitary ignorance, is very amusing, What will Mrs. Humfrey Ward say? It is a little amazing to find yet another interpretation of Galatians iii. 19: some scholar, delving amongst Rabbinical literature, will some day find the correct one.

Mr. Headlam continues his papers on the "Theology of the Epistle to the Romans"; the Reviews will be found very useful; and we would also notice an appreciative account of August Dillman.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Brooking, Rev. Samuel Augustus Edward, B.A., Vicar of St. Simon's, Leeds; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deanery of Leeds.

Buckley, Rev. James Rice, B.D., Vicar of Llandaff; Rural Dean of Llandaff Upper Deanery (South-Western Division).

Collinson, Rev. Thomas Harrison, M.A.; Rector of Newton Reigny, Penrith.

Flower, Rev. Canon W., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Ballarat; Archdeacon of Grafton, New South Wales.

Freeman, Rev. Richard M. P., M.A., Rector of Collen; Rural Dean of Drogheda.

Harvey, Rev. C. M., M.A., Rector of Acton; Chaplain of Acton Cemetery.

Heanley, Rev, Robert Marshall, M.A., Vicar of Upton Grey; Secretary of the National Society for Basingstoke Deanery.

Irvine, Rev. Arthur Benjamin, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, West Bromwich; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deanery of West Bromwich.

James, Rev. Herbert A., B.D., Principal of Cheltenham College; Head Master of Rugby School.

Jones, Rev. J. S., Vicar of St. Philip's, Clerkenwell; Rector of Colby, Norwich.

Joynt, Rev. R. C., M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Sheffield; Vicar of Christ Church, Gipsy-hill, Upper Norwood.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bellars, Rev. William, Vicar of Margate, at the Vicarage, Margate, on the 22nd inst., aged 45.

Bradstreet, Rev. William, late Rector of Theberton, and Rural Dean of Dunwich, at Windsor, on the 22nd inst., aged 83.

Brown, Rev. Meredith, M.A., first Vicar of Chittoe, at Nonsuch, Wilts, on the 23rd ult., aged 75.

Coulson, Rev. Thomas Borlase, M.A., Honorary Canon of Truro, late Vicar of Bramley, and Rector of St. Burian, at Tonbridge, on the 17th inst., aged 64.

Garven, Rev. Edward Dakin, Vicar of Bollington, Altrincham, at Warrington, on the 19th inst., aged 60.

Gloster, Rev. Thomas, M.A., formerly Incumbent of Ballyhaise, Diocese of Kilmore, at 16, Herbert-street, Dublin, on the 13th inst., aged 70.

Hensley, Rev. Charles, late Vicar of Cabourne, formerly Incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Gainsborough, at Knaith Cottage, Surbiton-hill, on the 24th inst., aged 96.

Hill, Rev. Edward James, M.A., J.P., Rector of Panfield, on the 18th inst., aged 70.

Hodgson, Rev. Richard, for twenty-five years Vicar, at St. Margaret's Vicarage, Dunham Massey, Altrincham, on the 14th inst., aged 66.

Holmes, Rev. Edward M., late Rector of Marsh Gibbon, Bucks, at Lowestoft, on the 20th inst., aged 66.

Kearsey-Thomas, Rev. Thomas, late Rector of Winforton, at Welton Lodge, Bath, on the 17th inst., aged 80.

The Church of England Pulpit.

HATRED, ENVY, AND AVARICE AT WORK.

By the Rev. Canon PHILIP DWYER, M.A.

Sermon preached in Burnham Church, Somerset, on March 17th, 1895.

"And they sat down to eat bread."—Gen. xxxvii. 25.

ALTHOUGH the Scriptures are truly graphic and often deal with minute local details, in themselves insignificant, yet the fact so carefully related in the words "And they sat down to eat bread" must have some special significance beyond a record of the everyday occurrence, that people eat and drink when they are hungry. So, to find this out, we must connect this "sitting down to eat meat" with what these men had just done. "It came to pass when Joseph was come unto his brethren, they stripped Joseph out of his coat, his coat of many colours, that was on him. And they took him and cast him into a pit, and the pit was empty, there was no water in it." Then we read, "And they sat down to eat meat." This may contrast with the pharisaical scrupulosity of those who had done to death Jesus, "that Just One"; "and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover." There were no scruples here, nor flushes of shame, nor twinges of conscience, nor regard of conventionalities even. They had joined together in this deed. They had agreed finally upon "a programme" of mutual support in a certain course of action. And they took the action, and (to use a common phrase) became "all tarred with one brush," became all tainted with a common defilement, and sustained a common deadness of the moral sense in consequence. And so it came to pass that these conspirators, tied to a common programme, exhibited a common selfishness and an utter insensibility. Whether or not they thanked God for the supply of food before them; whether or not they "washed their hands" before using it has not been recorded, but the main fact has been engraved indelibly, and is exhibited for everlasting remembrance and for the disgust of the honest, the humane, the brotherly of all after ages. After doing what they did, after shutting their ears to their brother's cries, after that (as they said themselves long subsequently), "We saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us and we would not hear," immediately after, and with nothing intervening, like men who had done a good morning's work and felt that they now owed a duty to themselves, "they sat down to eat bread," perhaps in view of the nullah or crevasse, into which, not killing their brother, nor to drown him, but leaving him to his fate, for all they knew or cared to the contrary, from wild beasts, from serpents, from scorpions, deliberately, composedly, peacefully, and fraternally "they sat down to eat bread."

II. This sad and instructive history needs a further analysis in respect of the actuating motives, which led to such a horrible course of action and to such a no less horrible moral depravation of character. Joseph, which means "May He (God) increase," was the oldest son of Jacob by Rachel. And Jacob loved him above all his other children; Joseph's character justified his father's warm affection. A profound fear of God, and the work of the Holy Spirit in his heart and a truly Christlike life (to the extent of his being one of the prominent and principal typical personages of the Old Testament, forecasting dramatically the chief incidents of Christ's life, death, passion, resurrection and glorious ascension), were the marked features of his pious, pure, beneficent and much-tried life of many vicissitudes.

Joseph is hated by his brothers because of his father's strong partiality for him, then he intensifies this "hatred" until it grew into the complex and settled malignity of "envy." This he does by telling of his dreams, about his future "dominion" over themselves, and even over their father and mother, the violation of which latter relationship, in patriarchal times, wore a heinous and impious aspect. The kindly old man, though he observed their sayings of animosity and traced them to its vile source ("they envied him"), yet sends the youthful Joseph, now some seventeen years old, to see whether it be well with thy brethren, "who were pasturing their flocks, and as it fell out 'at Dothan,' no doubt a place with rich and abundant herbage." When they saw him a far off, they conspired against him to slay him, holding it a righteous act so to deal with "this dreamer of dreams," though they did not make mention that "they hated him" also, because he wore his father's special token of love, "a coat of many colours." When they had agreed in their conspiracy, the first "programme" was "to slay him and cast him into some pit," and explain his absence by inventing a lie. Reuben defeated this, and suggested an improved "programme," which saved the conspirators from following the exact deed of Cain, though it answered their purpose just as well. It was to "pit" but not "kill" their brother. This was accepted as a compromise, and executed forthwith. Then occurred that celebrated feast, not "a love feast," but a "hate feast," which is evidently recorded to demonstrate that just as much as they were engaged in risking their brother's vitality, equally were they sinking their own morality. So

"while the meat was yet in their mouths," while their consciences were become "seared with a hot iron," but before Joseph could be fatally injured or die of despair, "they lifted up their eyes, and looked, and, behold, a company of Ishmaelites came from Gilead with their camels, bearing spicery and balm and myrrh, going to carry it down into Egypt." Why or how this caravan of traders took this exact way, whether there was a trail or not, why and how they appeared on this particular spot at this particular moment is evidently recorded to exhibit the fact, that God Almighty is the Moral Governor of the world, and rules it by known laws, as exhibited here in the insensibility of these conspirators, also rules it by His special providence, of which the Psalmist sang, "The wrath of man shall praise Thee, and the remainder of wrath shall Thou restrain," doubtless in allusion to this very incident. We read first of "the Ishmaelites." Their appearance gave occasion for Judah to interfere, as Reuben had done before. Judah argues with them, as with men who were not exclusively dominated by the passions of hate and of envy. He asks them, "What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood; come and let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let not our hand be upon him, for he is our brother and our flesh." And his brethren were content. They would not "kill him," nor leave him still "in the pit," because he was their "brother and flesh"; yet this did not prevent them from selling him for a slave, and making money of him, though he was "their brother and their flesh." Whether the distinction had much moral difference with these conspirators, it had a monetary difference. So they fell into the final alternative of their programme, and the basis and the impulse of "this programme," as it appears, is a combination of three of the most powerful, and beyond compare the very basest of the motives which can actuate man or devil. And these are, let me remind you: First, hatred; secondly, envy, "the rottenness of the bones"; and, thirdly, avarice. While this debate, so revolting, was going on, occasioned by the arrival of the "Ishmaelites," whose trade has been specified to the exclusion of "slaves," "then (verse 28) there passed by Midianites, merchantmen (who evidently would buy and sell anything that money could be made over), and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit, and sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites for twenty pieces of silver, and they brought Joseph into Egypt." How the conspirators pocketed their money, the cost-price of their "brother," and their "own blood," how they went home and made out a plausible lie, and cruelly told it, with confirmation as red as blood, though it was as black as hell, to the utter torture of their father and his sore grief, how "his sons" (these respectable performers of "the executed programme") and his daughters rose up to comfort him," but all in vain, one need not enlarge upon. But,

III. We come to the application of this history, in doing which we must touch upon some of the final incidents of this veracious and highly dramatic incident—I say "dramatic," for the essence of drama is free action of man with the resistless providence of an all-wise Moral Governor of the world, overruling it to His good purpose, and exposing to "shame and everlasting contempt" those whom He permits to violate His moral laws. But I must ask you to remember this, that, if God overrules evil to promote good, He also and always punishes and exposes it, so that a demoralised sophistry may not say, "Let us do evil that good may come."

I said we must apply this history, at the root of which are the three passions of hatred, envy, and avarice. Do not expect me to give all the illustrations of these hateful passions, which have filled the pages of history, and desolated the world, and become the fruitful suggestions of the most telling tragedies wrought into shape by the ablest dramatic artificers. A real poet of human nature tells in the compass of a line the whole story:

> Man's inhumanity to man
> Makes countless thousands mourn.

But where shall I begin? Well, begin you first at home. This is a home history, as sad a one almost as ever has been written. And, sad as it is, it may be equalled, or approached, or nearly re-enacted, to the desolation of home—that fairest ideal of human bliss and fondest counterpart of heavenly love. When covetousness, which is idolatry, when hatred, which is antichristianism, when envy, which is spiritually diabolical, get free scope in a family, the paradise of home is lost, and the era of "thorns and thistles" commences for weeping wanderers to plod through without love or hope.

Apply these influences to the case of social life. Why should I waste time and thought over the pictures of social life, blurred and faded and stained and rent, and with perspectives all upside down, which the comic artist plays with and our weekly satirists pile up, but with very little effect except upon their own greater or lesser popularity and profits. Is it a heresy, is it an insult, again to look to the hateful combination under review for a disclosure of the main factors which operate so disastrously in the economical and industrial life of England? I do not care to take sides here; but this I say with perfect confidence, that if "envy, hatred, malice," and avarice were once abated, then labour and capital, employers and workers, need not have Acts of Parliament or Councils of Conciliation to restore harmony and save the manufactures and commerce of England from making their home in foreign lands. But is this all? Alas! it is not. If I speak of the specialties of political life in this nineteenth-century England I may give offence. Every one who tells the

truth is sure to give offence. But anyhow, those who may have entered into combinations, which have their root and strength in motives such as are under discussion, are not expected to take much heed either of causes, methods, or consequences. Ah! no, it is too soon for this with them. "They sat down to eat bread." No, we must wait until the plot is ravelled out, until the finale is at hand, and the catastrophe disclosed. Callous—and must we call them conscientious—conspirators may, or may not, have a day of rude awakening, "Hardened now by the deceitfulness of sin," and not least of this composite sin, they may, though not themselves for certain, look back upon their past action, and smite their guilty breasts with horror and shame. Yes, they yet may cry out like our friends of the programme at the pit, "And they said one to another, we are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul when he besought us, and we would not hear, therefore is this distress come upon us." And won't there be present Reubens to chime in, "Saying, spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child, and ye would not hear, therefore behold also his blood is required."

I do not care in what particular item of political action you engage, I do not care how confident or how conscientious you may think yourselves, I do not care how comfortably; you now "may sit down to eat bread" in the very height of the horrible action, yet, as surely as you exercise your political rights at the expense of your brother's life or liberty, or religious or other rights, as surely as "you sell him to the Midianites," and pocket the price of your inhuman vote, in whatsoever coinage it is tendered as most pleasing to you—all this may be done by you, and you may go home well pleased with this remission secured to your credit and with that acquisition jingling in your purse, with this persuasion satiated, and that nuisance abated, yet as surely as there is a God above, you will feel the consequences of your promoting inhumanity and intolerance, even while you are sipping the sweets of avarice and feeding fat some ancient grudge of unbrotherliness. Political privileges are a moral responsibility. The laws of God can no more be violated with impunity at the English hustings than they can be violated at Sassoon or elsewhere by the Turk in Armenia.

No, brethren, you are vastly mistaken if you think that your iniquity will not find you out, in whatsoever department of your life, or exercise of your rights you commit iniquity. And the effects of such a complex passion as hatred, envy, and avarice must show themselves, first in your own moral induration, much and softly though you may flatter yourselves. Yes, it may injure and wrong and rob others, but yourselves it will also opiatize in an unrighteous dream that ends in a rude awakening. And next, all are not equally forgiving with Joseph; much otherwise. And thus the bitter sectarian animosities and resentments rising from the doings of the Usurpation era will run on and swell in triumphs of uncharity and in torrents of malignity, to the glory of Satan and the ruin of souls. Remember then the varied and serious applications of this narrative, lest after some inhuman and selfish action, in combination with others, you may then and there become like those who then "sat down to eat bread."

And now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding great joy, to the only wise God be glory and dominion for ever, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

THE TEMPLES OF THE HOLY GHOST.

By the Rev. CHARLES W. GANLY, Rector of Castledermot, Rural Dean, and Chaplain to the Duke of Leinster.

Sermon Preached in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, at Special Lent Service, on Wednesday, March 13th, 1895.

"What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body."—1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.

ST. PAUL frequently draws from his patriotic feelings and Jewish knowledge and experience lessons for Christian practice, and doctrine to edify the members of Christ's Church. I think there is no doubt that, when writing the words of the text and several of the preceding passages, he had in his mind the great house of God at Jerusalem, the temple of his fathers.

We know how in Old Testament times all the deep emotions of the Jewish heart was stirred as he approached the city of God, his thought would be: "The hill of Sion is a fair place, and the joy of the whole earth." Conspicuous above all else the golden domes and pinnacles of the temple, which made the holy hill a mass of architectural grandeur and beauty. The temple, rising in elevated majesty above the towers and palaces of the city, the central attraction of the whole Jewish Church, the meeting-place of God's chosen people from every part of the world, would fill the Jewish mind with ecstasy and enthusiasm as he approached it, and thought of the sacred associations connected with it—the place bought with a price, where God had been pleased to set His name, where the daily sacrifice had been offered for a thousand years; the place where the great Atonement was yearly made. "Oh," he would think, "how amiable are Thy dwellings, Thou Lord of Hosts! My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the Lord."

And how delighted he would be; how his soul would be uplifted as he heard one of the great choral services of Zion, such as were held there in the time of our blessed Lord, when the worship of Jehovah was maintained in its highest splendour, when every means was used to glorify the God of Israel in His temple. I think we can form a very poor idea of the glory and beauty of the service there. We know David had appointed four thousand Levites as musicians and singers, and the number was probably much increased in our Lord's time. We can think of the priests stationed at the pillars near the brazen laver, accompanying the anthem or psalm with the sound of their trumpets, and on the fifteen steps the Levites and the chosen muscians of Israel, with their cymbals, and cornets, and stringed and wood instruments, assisting the great organ; and then as the thousands of white-robed Levites, and the boys (their sons) joined in antiphonally, and as the innumerable multitudes filling the aisles and courts responded, or as all uniting in unison when the Alleluia with which the Psalms begin and end, thrice repeated, the united volume of vocal and instrumental sound poured forth as one voice, it seemed as if the people must feel conscious that God was there and was accepting their efforts to praise Him, to give Him glory with their body and with their spirits, with heart and voice uniting. And as this grand service of praise ascended up, there being no roof over most of the courts of the temple, the songs of Israel, the songs of Sion, would be heard all over the city and for miles around, and would be justly celebrated all the world over.

When our Saviour began his ministry at Jerusalem, the prophecy was fulfilled, "Jehovah, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple." I have no doubt He joined in these services which I have been feebly describing. I can fancy His blessed voice uniting in the glorious praise there given. He expresses no disapproval of it; it is not the music, or the service, or the prayers that He has to find fault with. He desires all these, but he desires also that His house of prayer shall be pure and free from earthly defilement, and so we find Him with authority at the beginning of His ministry, and also at its close, cleansing the temple. He desired that it should he holy—consecrated and devoted altogether to His service, His Father's house.

Now this was pre-eminently the Jewish teaching regarding God's temple from the first. Among the Jews the degrees of holiness of places by their own statement were eleven.

The land of Israel was more holy than other lands. The walled cities were more holy than the rest of the land. Within Jerusalem was holier than inside any other walled city. The mountain of the temple was more holy than Jerusalem. The court of the Gentiles was more holy than the mountain. Then, in order, came the Court of the Women, the Court of Israel, the Court of the Priests; between the porch and the altar was more holy than the lower part of the court. The temple proper was still more holy, and the oracle within the veil was the most holy of all, the Holy of Holies, where none might enter but the High Priest, and he only once a year.

In addition to this quaint description of the holiness of the temple, we know how the unclean were kept out of the temple, the many regulations, sanitary as well as spiritual, the numerous penalties and punishments for infringements of the laws regarding the pollution of the temple; and as we think of these we see how they become in the Apostle's mind symbolic, even when writing to the Gentile Church at Corinth. He had been treating in the passages preceding the text of the duty of temperance and chastity, so that the bodies of members of Christ's Church should be holy being the temples of God.

We, as members of the Church of Ireland, look upon our places of worship as consecrated, devoted to God's service, and it is to be hoped the time will never come when they shall be permitted to become in any sense secularised. Is there not a satisfaction and pleasurable and pious sensation in the thought that this great national Cathedral, now the centre of our Church in Ireland, has been devoted only to the worship and praise of our great God for centuries? How delightful the thought that for more than fourteen hundred years, through evil report and good report, in dark times and in brighter days, the service of God has been held here by the old Church of Ireland since the days of St. Patrick, for this cathedral stands o'er the foundations of the church founded here by the Apostle of Ireland, and this centre of our Church to-day links us with the past and with the earliest times of Christianity in this country in undoubted unbroken succession, a succession which we hope with God's help to pass on to those who come after us, and the Word of Life which it proclaims unsullied, and in its primitive purity as St. Patrick himself held it. It should be the aim and pride of every member of the Church of Ireland to make this the representative Church of our country, and to maintain in it and have continued those services which must give glory to our God and Saviour. While having pure and sound doctrine taught from its pulpit, and the Sacraments fitly and duly administered, we may also hope that the glorious service of praise which our service has been made by the devotion of the ablest choirs than can be procured in our country will be long continued within these sacred walls.

I have brought under your notice those salient points which distinguished the temple of God of old, and I would ask you to remember how forcibly the Apostle uses these with regard to individual members of Christ.

"What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?" Have you realised this? What a great honour God is pleased to confer on his faithful ones. How terrible it is to think of it in some aspects! We poor, weak, sinful, erring, self-willed, forgetful, undeserving creatures, the dwelling-places, the temples of God the Holy Spirit. It is sufficient to fill us with awe and dread, did we not know that Christ promised that the Holy Spirit would be a Comforter, that He would convince, and purify, and sanctify, and guide and never leave us or forsake us until He would bring us to glory. "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel and afterward receive me to glory." Oh, the condescension of the Holy Spirit dwelling next door to what is vile! We think much of the love of the Father and of the love of our adorable Redeemer, but do we ever think of the love of God, the Holy Spirit? do we seek to make our bodies meet to be His dwelling-place, His temple? Alas, here is a Lenten thought, how often we grieve the Spirit of God! Have you prepared your hearts for so divine a guest? Just think of the Queen of England coming to visit one of us, one of her subjects, do you not think we would clear out the house from lattice to cellar, and prepare for months before, so that nothing would offend the eye of one so great? It would not be necessary for a herald to come and say, see that there is nothing to offend the Queen when she comes. We should take care nothing should wound or hurt either her eye or ear.

Why is it different in the case we have been dwelling on? We have to be reminded "not to grieve the Spirit." He is a person and can be grieved by us, but how great His love is, though grieved He is not so offended as to be hopeless of us, He may go up and down the house grieved but will not go out of it. He is not our enemy, we do not grieve our enemies; we grieve our friends, He is our friend, and when we forget Him He is grieved. How He must be grieved at times with our words, with our thoughts, with our deeds. Have we no need to pray, "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from us"? The great glory of the temple of old was that God was there; the surpassing glory of the later temple was that the Lord Jesus—the Christ was there. And the glory of the member of Christ is that His body is the temple of the Holy Ghost. Shall we not devote ourselves to the work of making His temple then as worthy of Him as we may, and how shall we do so? "Therefore," says the Apostle, "glorify God in your body," and you will notice the reason he gives, "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price." He seems to say, "Look to Calvary's Cross, and see what has been done for you; you have been redeemed, you have been bought with the precious blood—the great Atonement of the Lord Jesus; and you think, in the quaint words of Mrs. Alexander, which you sung just now:

Soiled the robe He gave me
Pure, without a stain—
His blood, shed to save me,
Makes it white again.

And you realise the joy of believing, and "the gift" is stirred within you, and you see you owe Him service; you learn you must be pure for His sake; you are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body. Yes, let the Holy Spirit influence you, and you will glorify God in the fruits of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. Glorify God, and your place will always be filled in His house; you will have new delights ever fresh in His service, in prayer and praise and meditation, and in sweet and holy communion in the greatest glory He desires in the Eucharistic service of His Church. And give glory to God in your private devotions, in your home, in your daily life, for everywhere and always; if you are faithful and trusting, He, the Spirit of God, will be with you, in you, helping you, guiding, guarding, protecting, keeping, so that in you God may receive the honour due by you to His holy name.

* How shall He find His temple-home prepared
When He comes in?
That Light of Light, with purity divine,
Must it upon a soul's pollution shine?
Is it in ruins there—
Once in His sight so fair?
Will it be choked with noisome weeds within?

O, Lord of life, if it indeed be so,
Then grant, we pray,
Thine aid Divine, its beauty to restore!
Let it be cold, and dark, and foul no more;
But build it's altar up;
Pour out the brimming cup
Of Thine own love, to cleanse each stain away.

Ah! as within this great Cathedral Church
The sunbeams shine,
On pure and perfect beauty, may the light
Of heavenly grace and pardon, soft and bright,
Shine upon hearts made fair
By daily work and prayer—
Meet for Thy presence and Thy love Divine.

As many as seven retreats or quiet days are announced in last week's *Church Times*. Canon Gore holds his annual retreat for clergy at Selwyn College, Cambridge, in June. A quiet day "for ladies" was held at Kilburn, at the home of the Sisters of the Church, on April 2nd, and one "for women" at St. Peter's Home, Kilburn, on the same day. A quiet day "for men and women interested in social reform" was held by Canon Gore at St. John's, Red Lion Square, last Saturday. This last function was in connection with the Guild of St. Matthew.

* "Lyra Anglicana."

NOTICES.

Al communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper shoul be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1895.

TAFFY'S ODD TRICK.

MINISTERS have paid the consideration due for the devoted adherence of the Welsh wing, and have carried the second reading of the Welsh Disestablishment Bill by a majority of 44. It is curious, but characteristic, that the largest majority they have yet mustered should be for a purely destructive measure. It is also a singular coincidence that this performance should have followed so quickly upon the heels of the *reductio ad absurdum* of their entire policy, the motion for Home Rule all round, which was also carried.

In the Commons the real Disestablishment fight will now begin. Probably it will never be concluded, the third reading, if that stage is ever reached, will be attained by the closure, and then the Bill will join the Home Rule Bill. But every day the debate lasts will show more and more clearly that Disestablishment and Disendowment all round is the true objective. It will be the duty of the defenders of the Church to make this as plain as noonday. The English nation is inclined to be apathetic, it wants a deal of rousing, and on this occasion it will have to be roused. The fate of the historic Church of England must not be decided by the votes of thirty Members of Parliament, representing less than one-half of the electorate of twelve counties, for that is what it comes to. The demand for disestablishment and disendowment never arose in England, it was manufactured in Wales The present unhappy position of political parties has given the Welsh Radicals a unique opportunity of forcing their will on England, involving a catastrophe to the English Church. It is an odd state of things, which could occur in no country in the world except our own.

Happily, the English nation seems to be taking kindly to the rousing process. Englishmen are not always open to sentiment, but they are impressed by facts. And the Church has facts on her side. The revival of Church life and activity in Wales has been made public by this controversy. It has also been made interesting, even exciting, and thousands of voters have thus become possessed of information, willy-nilly, upon a subject which, ordinarily, they would have never given a thought to. In vulgar language, the Church has had such an advertisement as it never had before. And this has reacted as a stimulus, so that one might say the Church has hardly ever deserved such an advertisement before, not only in Wales, but in England.

This is most conspicuous in education. It is hardly conceivable that in the last two and a-half years, while neglecting no other claims, Church people should have given over three-quarters of a million for the development and improvement of their schools. And yet these figures are within the mark for the extraordinary expenditure over and above the usual working expenses. All the sects combined cannot show the like. The Church schools, considered moribund in 1870, are now educating about half the children of the country, and contain over half-a-million pupils more than the Board Schools. An institution containing such activities as this, and possessing such a hold upon the hearts of the people, is now wantonly attacked for the sake of a few votes in Parliament, which happen to be necessary to the existence of a struggling and discredited Government.

The real battle must be fought in a wider arena than the House of Commons. The campaign must now be vigorously carried on in the country. Every diocese and, if possible, every parish, should be organised for Church defence. The organisation ought to be entirely independent of party. It is our candid opinion that the Church has no more to expect from one party than from the other. The majority for the second reading of the Welsh Bill was swelled by some Liberal Unionists, who were probably returned to Parliament by the votes of Church people. And the programme of defence should, in the main, consist of the proper presentation of the facts of Church history and administration, as clearly expressed as possible. The splendid record, past and present, of the Church should be appealed to. In the long run truth will tell.

An important factor in the defence will be the speedy dissolution of Parliament. If there are any indications of a determination on the part of the Government to really drive this Bill to the end, then the sooner the appeal to the country comes the better before the issues are complicated. Disestablishment and disendowment would be a

good question to submit at the polls; it would certainly take precedence of Home Rule, the House of Lords, and all the Newcastle Programme. And the result need not be feared by Churchmen. Once laid to rest after a general election, Disestablishment would wake no more for the next half century at least, a consummation devoutly to be wished.

CHURCH NOTES.

LORD HALIFAX, it seems, has really had an interview with the Pope, as well as with Cardinal Vaughan, who is still at Rome. If the President of the E.C.U. desired to lay his ideas before the Holy Father, he could scarcely be refused an audience. Leo XIII. would even, it may be supposed, be eager to make his acquaintance, and to hear what he might have to say upon reunion, for there is no doubt that he is sincerely desirous to bring it about—on his own terms. Those terms will not, if we may trust the communication which the *Tablet* published recently, include the abolition of clerical celibacy, and if no concession is to be made on such a point as that, which involves no question of doctrine, the prospect for the re-unionists is not encouraging.

We have no authoritative account at present of the conversations between Lord Halifax and the Pope and Cardinal. Probably, however, the telegram published a day or two ago, on the authority of Reuter's Agency, represents the facts pretty truthfully. According to this authority, Lord Halifax is held at the Vatican to be too sanguine, as not having taken sufficient account of the difficulties to be surmounted before the Church of England can be brought to unite with Rome. In this opinion we suppose 99 out of every 100 of English Churchmen will concur. So far as appears hitherto, the attitude of the Papacy is as stern as ever. Its *non possumus* may be put in more polite language than formerly, but it is *non possumus* all the same.

On another question, only very remotely connected with schemes of re-union, the Pope will pretty certainly make an important concession. The Congregation of the Propaganda has, by a unanimous vote, resolved that the petition of a large body of English Roman Catholics, with the Duke of Norfolk at their head, that they may be allowed to send their sons to Oxford and Cambridge or other Protestant Universities, ought to be granted. The Pope has not yet formally approved the decision, but is regarded at Rome as certain that he will do so.

Many English Roman Catholics have, of course, from time to time studied and graduated at our Universities, but without the sanction of the ecclesiastical authorities, and candidates for the priesthood have not been allowed the advantage. If they should be in future, they will, of course, have to take a Divinity course under accredited teachers in their own faith. It seems probable, if rumour is correct, that a Roman Catholic institution will be founded at Oxford (possibly at Cambridge also) on the lines of the Nonconformist Mansfield College, where Roman Catholic students will be instructed in their religion, and pursue their general studies like the other members of the University. Cardinal Vaughan is understood to be a warm advocate of the proposed change.

Lord Abergavenny has presented the Rev. W. Craig to the living of Llanhileth, but the Bishop of Llandaff will not institute him, on the ground that he cannot speak Welsh. A non-Welsh-speaking clergyman was presented a few years ago to the vicarage of Goytre, and the Bishop sustained his right to refuse institution. If we had only had Welsh Bishops as conscientious and courageous a hundred years ago, Mr. Asquith's Disestablishment Bill would never have been heard of.

We learn from the *English Churchman* that the Rev. John Savile Tucker, M.A., Assistant Master at Wellington College, has been appointed Head Master of Trent College. He is the eldest son of Mr. John Henry Tucker, of the Bank of England, and was a scholar of Balliol College, Oxford, and afterwards Senior Mathematical Scholar of the University, and took a first-class in both Moderations and Finals. Trent College, as some readers may need to be told, is a public school for boys conducted upon the strictest of Evangelical principles.

The Dean of Durham, Dr. Kitchin, has set an excellent example to clergymen, and especially to dignitaries, who share his political views. In declining an invitation to be present at a meeting of the Durham City Women's Liberal Association, the Dean said that, although warmly attached to Liberal principles, he did not wish to take a public part in politics.

The Rev. R. C. Joynt, of Sheffield has accepted the vacant vicarage of Christ Church, Gipsy Hill. His removal from Sheffield, where he is exceedingly popular, places the living of St. George's in that town at the disposal of the new Vicar, Canon Eyre. The benefice to be filled is worth £600 a year, with a house.

The *Record* makes the announcement that, as soon as Lent is over, a special effort is to be made in every diocese to complete its organisation in defence of the Church. The full diocesan committees are to be summoned to meet one or other of the members of the Central Church Committee; reports will be presented upon the work already done; and arrangements will be made for increasing the number of parochial committees, and bringing them into the highest state of efficiency. The formation of 5,000 parochial committees has now been reported to the Central Church Committee. The names of 2,000 secretaries have been sent in since March 1st, and each of these secretaries has a band of workers at his back.

The death was announced a few days ago of the Vicar of Margate, the Rev. William Bellars. Mr. Bellars, who was only 45, was a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, and was Burney Prize Essayist in 1880. He was well known in London, having been Curate of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, from 1880 to 1882, and of All Hallows, Barking, from 1884 to 1888, when he was presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the vicarage of Margate. From 1882 to 1884 he was Vice-Principal of the Leeds Clergy School.

Birmingham has been the scene of a great gathering of Nonconformists, under the title of National Congress of Free Churches. The claim put forward by Dissenters to be "free" in any special sense of the word is about as well-founded as that of the Romanists to be the only "Catholics," but if they like the term, it may be allowed to pass. The interest of the movement for those who are not members of a "free church" lies in the tendency which it displays towards consolidation of the sects. The Nonconformists are apporently coming to recognise the fact

that infinitesimal differences about Church order and discipline do not justify separation, still less hostile action. The logical conclusion, which will not be reached for a long time, if it is ever reached, is that there is ample room and verge enough for very many who are now excluded in the Church of the nation. The Congress is undoubtedly a protest against Dissent in the abstract, and may lead some thoughtful and candid Dissenters to reconsider their position.

The occasion has suggested to a sympathetic reporter of the proceedings the remark that Birmingham is not a religious town, and the figures which he quotes (from a census of public worship taken three years ago) bear out the saying. The Church of England possesses in Birmingham and its suburban districts 152 places of worship, with 82,201 sittings. Less than half these sittings are ordinarily occupied. The "free churches" number 274, but again the attendance is on the average much less than half the number of sittings. Moreover, the sittings themselves are only equal to 27 per cent. of the population; and only 59 per cent. of this 27 are actually used at any one time.

Canon Gore (who was the preacher at Dr. Percival's consecration the other day), in a recent sermon at Westminster Abbey, told a story of the late Dr. Dale. He said that when Dr. Dale, as a young man, was rising into celebrity as a preacher at Carr's Lane Chapel, in Birmingham, an old minister remarked, "I hear you were preaching doctrine; you had better give that up. The people won't stand it." Dr. Dale replied, "Ah, but I shall make them stand it." "Dr. Dale," said Canon Gore, "persevered in his doctrinal sermons, and the people stood it remarkably well."

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Christ the Bread of Life. (Read St. John vi. 25-35.) Introduction.—Jesus tried more than once to explain and enforce on the minds of the Jews His Divinity and Mission; but it was hard to make His statements plain and convincing to minds deeply prejudiced against Him. "He came unto His own, but His own received Him not." He, Jesus, wanted to convince the Jews that He was indeed the Bread of Life. Jesus gives us in the portion of Holy Scripture we have read a powerful argument that He alone is the true bread that cometh down from heaven. Our daily bread is the staff of life for the body; the soul must be sustained with the heavenly bread daily. We cannot live, we cannot be sustained, we cannot be fruitful, we become dead, having no life or nourishment. The world cannot comprehend this, neither could the Jews in the time of Christ. Yet the world is famishing, and needs the life-giving bread of life in the universal bestowment of the blessings of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Man cannot be satisfied alone with the bread that perisheth.

O food that weary pilgrims love,
O bread of angel-hosts above,
O manna of the saints.

We may notice a few practical inferences from this subject:—1. Man cannot be satisfied with the world alone. 2. The world cannot give peace. 3. Jesus alone able to satisfy the cravings of the soul; Jesus is the life of His people. 4. We are as dead without Christ. 5. Christ alone brought us salvation and life. —THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

REASON AS THE BASIS OF FAITH.

THE Rev. Prebendary J. W. Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham Street, E.C., stated:—We know of force, of matter, of time, of eternity, of space, of infinitude not wholly by thought, for they exceed our thinking power, and our knowing of them is by more than thought. This knowledge of that which we cannot demonstrate by any experiment is seen in what are regarded as the realities of advance by which human nature was created The basis and crown of our nature are not so much argumentative power as a perception and apprehension of truth, whose nature is beyond argument. This may be seen more definitely if we consider the conservation of energy as a permanent principle. Demonstration of it cannot be given. We are unable to say that all worlds are alike, and still more incapable of truly asserting as to the condition of other universes than of that of which we are a portion. Higher reason accepts the hypothesis. It shows, when truly thought of, that the Eternal relating Himself to the finite, reveals in the resemblance of things one to another, the unity of their origin. He further shows that the Power is accompanied by a not less wonderful Wisdom, for the infinite variety of change turning present impossibles into future possibles is ever and ever a revelation of the unknown. We know this as one of the great verities, but it is not capable of physical demonstration; therefore it belongs to that higher reason which, ascending by terrestrial and celestial phenomena, enters the presence of the Eternal and worships, "Grant unto us, O Lord, eternal rest, and let shine upon us Thy perpetual Light."

"The Making of Mind" (Part II.) will be the subject next Wednesday.

CANON KNOX-LITTLE is prevented by illness from fulfilling his engagement to preach at the mid-day services at St. Paul's during Passion Week.

A SUGGESTIVE story as to the social condition of the American clergy, at any rate, in the rural districts, is told by the New York correspondent of the *Rock* A Bishop some time ago stated that when he visited the rural parts of his diocese he was always careful to wear patent leather boots, for if he did not he felt sure that his boots would be blacked by the hands of each clergyman whose parish he visited. This, the correspondent remarks, will illustrate the absence of hired help in country clerical households, and the comparative poverty in which the country clergy live.

ONE does not often hear of a clergyman being fined for not keeping his children at school, possibly because very few clergymen send their children to public elementary schools. The Rev. W. Jackson, vicar of Monks Kirby, is, however, an exception, and he was lately fined 5s. at Lutterworth Sessions for not sending his boy regularly to the elementary school of which he is a manager. Evidence showed that the defendant's son had only made 84 attendances out of 162. The defendant urged, as a reasonable excuse, that his boy was so studious and advanced that regular attendance was unnecessary, but the Bench held that he must obey the same rules and regulations as people of lower station, so long as his son remained in the school.

Reviews and Notices.

"HIGHER CRITICISM." Old Testament Theology. By Dr. Hermann Schultz, Professor of Theology in the University of Gottingen. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

"HISTORY, PROPHECY, AND THE MONUMENTS." By James Fred. McCurdy, Ph.D., LL.D. Vol. I. London: Macmillan & Co.

OPINIONS doubtless differ as to what in the future will be the Church's most serious danger; what rocks ahead most threaten her. Some would answer, the maintenance of the Church schools, and from one point of view we certainly agree. Some fear the growth of Ritualism, and the favour—and something more than favour—shown by a large section of both clergy and laity to the Church of Rome. But some may think that the most pressing danger of all is the shock which "Higher Criticism," as it is absurdly called, is giving to the faith of many. That the faith of many has been, and is being, shaken there can, we think, be no doubt; and, in consequence, "Higher Criticism" is an anxiety to many, and that, whether they agree with it or not. Of course those who entirely disagree see nothing but danger, and some even say that Higher Criticism=Infidelity. But those who do not go so far, those who feel that much will have to be accepted, and that, on the whole, "Higher Criticism" has removed more difficulties than it has raised, may yet justifiably feel very anxious. For every way there are dangers. It is dangerous for that to be taught in one parish which in the next is denounced as infidelity, especially since we of the Church of England have no tribunal to whose judgment the question can be referred. It is dangerous for doubts to be raised as to correctness of opinions, even of those only popularly held, and for suspicions to be cast on teaching which for long years has been commonly accepted and believed, unless it is certain both that the clergy are competent to supply better, and that the laity are prepared to accept the same. It is very dangerous for every new theory to be openly—more openly than wisely—discussed in the columns of the *Contemporary* or the *Nineteenth*, because the knowledge, or, rather, ignorance of the average man is such that he will almost certainly misunderstand, and will draw therefrom wrong conclusions, and, at any rate, he will be startled and surprised, and very likely end by becoming sceptical and suspicious.

And "Higher Criticism" is, to the average man, sufficiently surprising. The Book of Genesis is now taught to be "legendary"; Isaac, Jacob, and Israel, we are told, are merely tribal names; the authorship of the Pentateuch (or rather, Hexateuch), including what used to be called the Mosaic legislation, is assigned—part (but very small part) to Moses; part to the Elohist and Jehovist, both of uncertain date, but each of them about the eighth century B.C.; part to the unknown Deuteronomist of the age of Josiah; and the rest to the age beginning with Ezekiel and ending with Ezra. And this, in the main, at any rate, is accepted and taught, not only by many, probably most, of the Divinity professors in Oxford and Cambridge, but it can also be found even in so popular —we use the word, of course, in a good sense—a book as Dr. Sanday's Bampton Lectures. Therein the laity may read that "There are four stages in the history of the Law: (1) the actual beginning, limited in extent and indeterminate in outline, which Moses was inspired to lay, of the Pentateuchal legislation, with its acceptance by the people; (2) the committal to writing of the Book of the Covenant, already regarded as Heaven-given and binding upon the conscience; (3) the promulgation of the Deuteronomic Code by Josiah in 621 B.C.; and (4) the final promulgation of the complete, or all but complete, body of Pentateuchal laws by Ezra and Nehemiah in 444 B.C." ("Inspiration," p. 235). All this is so entirely different from the opinions which almost all the laity and the great bulk of the clergy—those over forty, at any rate—were brought up to hold, that we do not wonder that many of the laity are suspicious; that some are beginning to ask, Can the old faith live with the new criticism? and that those of the clergy who feel the weight of authority and learning on the side of "Higher Criticism," and who would be ashamed to shriek Infidelity! at men like Canon Driver, Dr. Sanday, and many others, feel perplexed, and, hardly knowing their position, are hampered and hesitating in their teaching both in the pulpit and in the classroom.

Hence a good book, learned but not too learned or too technical, and written, above all, in a thoroughly reverential tone and spirit, which shall show how "Higher Criticism" may be accepted, and may even be an aid to faith, will surely be to many a great boon. And, though we are not prepared to endorse all his statements or conclusions, we think Professor Schultz's book, which stands at the head of our list, will be just such a help. It is not an "Introduction," bristling with references, which a student will work at, but which no one can possibly read; it contains no passages which seem written *at* Christianity, like Mr. Montefiore's otherwise useful and certainly very interesting Hibbert Lectures; and it is quite free from the rhetoric and gush of Miss Wedgwood's "Message of Israel." In a word, it is a readable book, learned enough for the clergy, interesting enough for the layman. It is divided into two main divisions: the first discusses the devolpment of religion and morals in Israel down to the founding of the Asmonean state; the second discusses Israel's consciousness of salvation and religious view of the world, the product of the religious history of the people. The standpoint of the author is that of the Higher Critics, but by no means blindly. Much of Genesis he also calls legendary, but his section on the value of legends (if rightly understood) in early religions is full of interest. But let this pass, the last word on the correctness of the early narratives of Genesis has not yet been said; Professor Sayce's book has been sneered at, not answered. But on many other points still under controversy his conclusions are far less sweeping than those of the "advanced" school of Higher Critics, for of course there are Higher Critics *and* Higher Critics. He maintains, for instance, that "not only must the collection of laws in Exodus xxi.-xxiii. be older than the year 800 B.C., but a much larger part of the Pentateuch." The Jehovist he assigns to the time of Solomon, and the Elohist he is "inclined" to assign to the end of the Mosaic period. This, again, is far earlier than even Dr. Sanday's date. He is indeed hard on the "Priest Code," so are they all, except Mr. Montefiore, who, in his Hibbert Lectures, shows that the "Priest Code" is far less unspiritual and merely ritualistic than is commonly asserted. Of course he does not

gush about "priests" like Miss Wedgwood, but he says the influence of Ezra and the "Priest Code" was such that "statutes relating to sacred form and the exact provision for the external holiness of Israel became the foundation-stone of national life," while "the prophets, on the contrary, had regarded faith and morality as the essential characteristics of the nation founded by Moses" (I. 335). Still he is not unfair; he says also of the period dominated by the "Priest Code," that is, of the Persian age, "It was just in these last days that Israel attained what the most brilliant epochs of her history had never realised. The outward commonwealth of Israel and the ideal of the people corresponded so far at any rate as that is possible on earth. In the new Jerusalem there was neither idolatry nor giddy worldly enjoyment. None but the God of Israel could be worshipped in His holy city. Decorous conduct, religious gravity, and hearty zeal for the nation's allotted task characterised every member of the new community. For only persons of this stamp could, in the circumstances, feel impelled to return home in hope and faith. This was really a people of God. Those who were Israelites after the flesh wished to be so after the spirit, and that at least honestly. The new temple was actually a house through the gates of which righteous men entered in the name of the Lord. And the community among which the Psalms of Ascent originated manifested a personal piety and a sincerity of religious feeling which would compare favourably with the best ages" (I. 328.) Then Ezra and the much abused "Priest Code" have much to say for themselves. And on the special features of the religion of Israel—on feasts, sacrifices, prophetism (an exceedingly well written section), the law, etc., Professor Schultz has much to say which is valuable, and all of which is told clearly and interestingly, so that in a convenient form most readers will have all they want as to the views and standpoint of one, at any rate, of those who accept the position of the Higher Critics, and yet to all appearances finds faith stronger rather than weaker. And as such we strongly recommend the book to those (and we think they are many) to whom "Higher Criticism" has been the cause of much anxious thought, since whether or not they agree with the writer (and of course we do not profess wholly to agree with him) they will see that the methods and conclusions of "Higher Criticism" *need* not cause that shock to the faith which at first sight they certainly appear to cause. After reading Professor Schultz, we think any candid reader will admit that though the environment is now different, yet the Divine essence of the Old Testament is still there, and perhaps is there even more clearly; that we still have, as a whole, the same Bible, only its parts are differently pieced. Professor Schultz *insists* on that Divine essence. "In Israel," he says (I. 54), "the knowledge of God was attained exclusively in a religious way under the influence of the Divine, and is therefore purely practical. In no sense was it reached along the line of philosophy and poetry. But an original religious conviction of this kind is never to be understood as a result merely of previously existing conceptions or circumstances. As an experience of forces which lie outside the world of sense, it has its roots in the communication of the spirit through the love and mercy of God to such members of the human family as are privileged to become interpreters to their brethren of the heavenly life, that is to say, in a Divine revelation. Israel's religious teachers are prophets, not philosophers, priests, or poets. Hence the Old Testament religion can be explained only by revelation, that is by the fact that God raised up for this people men whose natural susceptibility to moral and religious truth, developed by the course of their inner and outer lives enabled them to understand intuitively the will of the self-communicating, redeeming God regarding men, that is, to possess the religious truth which maketh free not as a result of human wisdom and intellectual labour, but as a power pressing in upon the soul with irresistable might. Only those who frankly acknowledge this can be historically just to the Old Testament." And this is not merely a soothing sentence, intended to lull the suspicions of the watchful; the tone of the book, as we have before remarked, is reverent throughout.

Our limits are nearly exhausted, but we should like to suggest one or two more points on the hopeful side. First, we would point out that more attention will be given to Israel's history from every side, not merely from the theological side, so to speak. Professor McCurdy's misnamed book has for its object to tell, as simply as possible, the story of the ancient Semitic peoples, including, as the dominating theme, the fortunes of Israel. He sketches the history of Israel as influenced by the Babylonians, Hittites, Egyptians, Assyrians, etc., and, as the preface says, in the interest of the study of the Old Testament. As yet only the first volume has appeared; we hope when the second is received to give both volumes a more full and complete notice. But "Higher Criticism" will call forth more volumes on the same lines as Professor McCurdy's, more on Professor Sayce's lines, and the more volumes and the more light from every side the better.

Secondly, the study of "Higher Criticism," no matter from what standpoint, draws attention to the teaching of the great prophets, Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah of Jerusalem, and certainly nothing but good can come of that. Nothing can possibly be better for this uncommonly childish age than to have its attention turned from vestments, posturings, bazaars, and other follies, and worse than follies, to the stern manliness of the Hebrew prophets. Their teaching will come like a sea breeze into a vitiated atmosphere. And even a superficial acquaintance with "Higher Criticism" must mean *some* study of the prophets.

"Higher Criticism" will, probably after many modifications, prove to be one of the many stages on the road to the truth, yet for the reasons we have given, and for many others, it may cause grave difficulties to arise in the near future. None but an optimist, at any price, can see in it no dangers; none but those who are indifferent to their duties as teachers can wholly neglect it.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

A CRITICISM.

SIR,—The book noticed in the PULPIT of March 23rd appears to be full of misrepresentations. Thus it is said that our Lord "was somewhat harsh to the mother who bare Him"; but St. John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," tells us that even on the Cross

"He saith to the disciple, Behold thy mother (John xix. 27; xiii. 23). That "He was hard on the rich young man"; but St. Mark says, "Jesus, beholding him, loved him" (Mark ix. 21). That "He was hard on the priests"; but to the first leper healed He said, "Go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded for a testimony unto them" (Matt. ix. 4). That "He was hard on the Scribes and Pharisees"; but St. Matthew tells us that He "spake to the multitude and to His disciples, saying, The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not" (Matt. xxiii. 1, 2). "The charges which our Lord uttered are amply supported by Jewish testimonies: *e.g.*, in Midrash Esth. i., f. 101, 4, it is said that there are ten portions of hypocrisy in the world, of which *nine* are at Jerusalem" (Schöttgen) (Farrar, "Life of Christ," p. 570, n. 1.).

Further, it is said, "A good Jew cannot condone an affront to the sacred Law, nor forgive what he conceives to be blaspemy against God . . . . and the book before us shows us clearly why the catastrophe was inevitable." But did not our Lord say, "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law. . . . . I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil"; and did He not teach men to do the will of God, saying, "Whosoever shall do the will of My Father who is in heaven, the same is My brother and sister and mother"? (Matt. vii. 21; xii. 50). And where was the "good Jew," the "conscientious Jew," to be found at this period? Not, certainly, in the person of the High Priest Caiaphas, who said, "Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is *expedient for us* that one man should die for the nation, and that the whole nation perish not" (John xi. 49, 50).

Let us ask Josephus, the contemporary Jewish writer—who was present at the destruction of Jerusalem—for his testimony: "I shall, therefore, speak my mind here at once briefly—that neither did any other city suffer such miseries, nor any other age ever breed a generation more fruitful in wickedness than this was, from the beginning of the world." "Nor did Jerusalem on any other account so much deserve these sore misfortunes as by producing a generation of men who were the occasions of this its overthrow" (Josephus, "Wars of the Jews," V., x. 5; VI., viii. 5).

Again, something is said about "using magic, as Jochanan did"—Jochanan denoting, apparently, John the Baptist; but the Evangelist records that "Many resorted unto Him," in the place where John at first baptised, "and said John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true" (John x. 40, 41). If John the Baptist did no miracle, how could it be supposed that he "used magic"? Also, if really "the messenger of the congregation in the Galilean synagogue called out, 'Let Rabbi Joshua ben Joseph arise,'" would not the congregation have been startled at hearing in English or Hebrew that which they could only have understood if uttered in Greek or Aramaic? It would surely be a mistake to suppose that Hebrew, which for centuries had been a dead language, was still specially spoken, of all places in the world, in the neighbourhood of "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Isaiah ix. 1).

Once more: "If He was careless of the nation's hopes," writes the scribe, "may it not have been because He felt Himself outside the nation, and His most un-Jewish dictum, 'Let the dead bury their dead,' no doubt carries out the idea." But how could He, who "was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," feel Himself outside the nation? and if He had so felt, how would this have affected the actions of Him who "pleased not Himself"? (Mat xv. 24; Rom. xv. 3). What did the un-Jewish dictum declare but the deadness of the Jewish people, and the spirituality and paramount importance of the Gospel?

It is not probable that the words, "Let son and daughter inherit alike," could have fallen from the lips of that Divine Teacher who, in reply to the petition, "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," said, "Man, who made Me a judge or divider over you?" (Luke xii. 13, 14).

The "touch" as to "the faded rose-wreath of some Roman reveller" may be "graphic," but is not true; for St. John tells us that "the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns and put it on His head" (John xix. 2).

"The vituperative cry, Manizer!" could not have been applied to one, in the words of St. Luke, "about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph" (Luke iii. 23). The only incident, after the circumcision, recorded of these first thirty years of our Saviour's earthly life is the visit to the Temple described in Luke ii. The expression, therefore, "the unknown decade of the Redeemer's life," is incorrect; but it suggests the inquiry whether the reserve and silence of Holy Scripture about some matters connected with the mystery of Redemption—"which things the angels desire to look into" (1 Pet. i. 12)—might not well be imitated by those rash, romancing realistic writers of our time, who, while aiming at realism, are somewhat apt to ignore facts. The book, as a whole, appears to be more or less an imitation of a not unknown American work, which, however excellent the intention, exhibited the not unknown American failing of want of reverence.

H. HEBER EVANS.

March 27th, 1895.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIR,—There is an important point which ought to be brought forward as quickly as possible, namely, that there is a large number of Members of Parliament who do not believe in Christianity in any form.

Forty years ago there were probably not more than five such Members in the House of Commons; yet so rapid has been the increase, that ten years ago their numbers were computed at 50 or 60, which at that rate would bring up the number of such Members to 70 or 80 in the present House.

At this rate, as far as Christian Government is concerned, it will not be long before the country returns to the original state it was in before Christianity was brought to our shores.

There can be no doubt as to the hostile attitude of this large body of non-Christian Members of Parliament towards the Bill dealing with the principal Christian Institutions in the country. Are non-Christians to legislate for Christians in religious matters? A Member of Parliament would probably say, "By what right do you question my religious opinions?" The answer to which is, "Because you attack my religious institutions; leave my religion alone, and I leave yours alone." The hon. Member would say, "But this is a State matter, and my constituents elected me to represent them in Parliament." Then comes this question, "Did you, when a candidate for Parliament, tell your constituents that you did not believe in

Christianity?" The reply would certainly be, "No, because it was no business of theirs." Now is shown the practical results of it being "no business of theirs," for the number of non-Christian Members in the House is about four times larger than the Government's majority; and here is the consequence—Christian Institutions are now in the hands and at the mercy of non-Christians. What would the country say if they knew this? In London it is tolerably well known in certain circles; but the great Christian heart of the country knows nothing at all about it; but they will, and when it is thoroughly realised it will surely follow that candidates for Parliament in future will have to satisfy their constituents that they are at least Christians; for absolute silence on this subject has enabled such increasing numbers of non-Christian candidates to steal a march unchallenged and to enter Parliament.

Sooner or later a general election will have to be fought on the broad, simple question—"Is Christianity to remain the National Religion or not?"

ROBERT P. C. CORFE.

Molesey, Hampton Court,
March 25th, 1895.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Archbold, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Principal of Norwich Diocesan Training College for Schoolmistresses; Rector of Burgate, Suffolk.

Bourne, Rev. Robert, B.A.; Rector of Little Ellingham, and Vicar of Great Ellingham, Norfolk.

Butler, Rev. Herbert Edward, Vicar of Wolstanton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Lichfield.

Crabbe, Rev. William, Perpetual Curate of Sutton Cheney, Hinckley.

Crokat, Rev. Robert Campbell, M.A., formerly Curate of Stourpaine, Dorset; Vicar of Broad Hinton, Wilts.

Crump, Rev. John Herbert, M.A., Rector of Stoke; Rural Dean of Stoke.

Daniell-Bainbridge, Rev. Howard Gurney, M.A., Minor Canon of Westminster Abbey; Honorary Priest in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Davies, Rev. J. T., M.A., Head Master of the King's School, Chester; General License, Diocese of Chester.

De Vine, Rev. Wilson Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Tipton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Lichfield.

Doman, Rev. J. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Bolton-le-Moors, and Rural Dean of South Bolton; Canon of Manchester Cathedral.

Dorrity, Rev. David, M.A., Chaplain of Henshaw's Blind Asylum and of the Manchester Schools for the Deaf and Dumb, Old Trafford; Rector of St. Anne with St. Mary, Manchester.

Dunn, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Stretton; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Staffordshire (Mr. Francis Monckton).

Ffolkes, Rev. F, A. S., B.A.; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Norwich, Rural Deanery of Beccles.

Fitzpatrick, Rev. T. H.; Principal of the Harris High School, Royapettah, Madras.

Gamble, Rev. Henry Reginald, M.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Wells-street; Vicar of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate.

Goddard, Rev. C, F.; Vicar of Clearwell, Gloucestershire.

Gregson, Rev. Francis Sitwell Knight, M.A., Senior Curate of Christ Church, Gateshead-on-Tyne; Vicar of All Hallows, Leeds.

Hickman, Rev. Herbert, M.A.; Vicar of St. Mary's, Frome.

Hodge, Rev. Robert Vere, M.A., Vicar of Middleton; Secretary of the National Society for Sutton Coldfield Deanery.

Holbech, Rev. Canon, of Bloemfontein; Archdeacon of Kimberley.

Hunt, Rev. H. W., Rector of Shermonbury, Sussex; Rural Dean of Lewes (IV.).

Jesson, Rev. T., LL.B.; Rector of Bishop's Cleeve, Gloucestershire.

Lyons, Rev. John Charles, B.A., Curate-in-Charge; Rector of Neenton Salop.

Majendie, Rev. Henry William, M.A., Vicar of Tor-Mohun; Secretary of the National Society for Torquay (Ipplepen Deanery).

Maplesden, Rev. A. W.; Senior Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Rochester.

Morris, Rev. Joseph; Vicar of the New Church, St. John's, Mosley-common.

Nance, Rev. James Trengrove, M.A., B.D.; Rector of East Farndon, Market Harborough.

Newman, Rev. W. J. H., M.A.; Vicar of East Dean, Singleton, Sussex.

Park, Rev. George E., Curate of Mexboro; Curate-in-Charge of Christ Church, Knottingley.

Raikes, Rev. T. Digby, M.A., Assistant-Master at Radley College; Vicar of Marcham, Abingdon.

Raven, Rev. John James, D.D.; Vicar of Metfield, Suffolk.

Rees, Rev. John Francis, B.A., Vicar of Abertillery; Rector of Llangyn-hafal, Ruthin.

Robinson, Rev. A. D. J., B.A., Rector of Colby, Norfolk; Vicar of St. Philip's, Clerkenwell.

Rust, Rev. John Basil, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Mile-end New Town; Secretary of the National Society for Spitalfields Deanery.

Shute, Rev. Charles Commeline, B.A., Vicar of Shalfleet; Secretary of the National Society for West Wight Deanery.

Silver, Rev. E. W., M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Haggerstone; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Archdeaconries of Winchester and the Isle of Wight.

Smith, Rev. F. R., M.A.; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Norwich, Rural Deanery of South Elmham.

Sowter, Rev. George Arthur, M.A., Rector of St. George's, Birmingham; Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester.

Spain, Rev. T. Dixon, Rector of Rand; Organising Secretary of the Lincoln Diocesan Branch of the Church of England Temperance Society.

Steedman, Rev. Charles Mackenzie, M.A., lately Curate of Bemberton, Wilts; Vicar of Shaw, Wilts.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Byrth, Rev. Henry Stewart, M.A., for thirty-three years Vicar of Bardsley, and Rural Dean of Ashton-under-Lyne, on the 24th ult.

Cole, Rev. William, Rector, at Hotham Rectory, East Riding, on the 27th ult., aged 75.

Garbett, Rev. Charles, M.A., for twenty-six years Vicar of Tongham, and for twenty-five years previously Chaplain in the H.E.I. Co.'s Service, and on the Indian Establishment, at Tongham Vicarage, Surrey, on the 26th ult., aged 80.

Hillyer, Rev. G. W., late Vicar of Coldharbour, Dorking, at Brighton, on the 28th ult., aged 78.

Howes, Rev, Thomas George Francis, M.A., for fifty-eight years Rector of Belton, and formerly Rural Dean, at Belton Rectory, Great Yarmouth, on the 30th ult., aged 88.

Lathom-Browne, Rev. David George, Junior Chaplain Bengal (Rangoon) Establishment, at Old Quebec street, London, on the 29th ult., aged 41.

Longmire, Rev. Joseph Leopold, formerly Rector of Sandiacre, at Hastings, on the 17th ult., aged 77.

Maclean, Rev. Hippisley, Canon of Lincoln, and for forty-two years Vicar of Caistor, Lincolnshire, at St. Albans, on the 23rd ult, aged 88.

Parry, Rev. Howard Lewis, for thirty-eight years Vicar of Clearwell, at Clearwell Vicarage, Gloucestershire, on the 13th ult., aged 73.

Payne-Smith, Rev. Robert, Dean of Canterbury, on the 31st ult., aged 76.

Peppin, Rev. Stephen Francis Bedford, M.A., Priest-Vicar of Wells Cathedral, and Vicar of Horrington, at Bath, on the 27th ult., aged 62.

Peter, Rev. Lewis M., at Trevilis, Cornwall, on the 30th ult., aged 78.

Raikes, Rev. Frederick Thornton, Vicar of Milnthorpe, at Milnthorpe, on the 26th ult., aged 76.

Smith, Rev. William Lilley, Rector of Dorsington, on the 20th ult., aged 68.

Startin, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of the Parish, at Horrabridge, on the 27th ult.

Woods, Rev. Chancellor, at Brook House, Llandevand, on the 24th ult.

Wright, Rev. Henry, M.A., forty-nine years Rector of Thuxton, on the 26th ult., aged 79.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE WELLS OF SALVATION.

By the Rev. J. REID, Rector.

Sermon Preached in Newtownsaville on November 11th, 1894.

"Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation."—Isaiah xii. 3.

In some Eastern lands water was as precious as gold. Digging a well was the work of kings and princes, and the man who dug one was a benefactor of his race. The value of wells can only be understood and appreciated by those who know something of the scarcity of water in the East, especially in the summer season. In Egypt, for instance, it is known that rain seldom or never falls, and whatever fertility the country possesses it owes chiefly to the overflowing of the Nile, which, as the Scripture says, "overflows its banks all the time of harvest." The tropical rains, which fall in the end of June and in the months of July and August, and the melting of the snow on the mountains north of the equator, where the Nile has its rise, cause an annual inundation of the land on each side of the river. This overflow of the water deposits a rich alluvial mud on the sand, and renders it marvellously fertile. The cultivator has little more to do than scatter his seed, which is usually thrown on the water, and when the flood subsides it springs up with amazing rapidity and richness. This may remind us of that Scripture which says, "Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days." No doubt this idea is borrowed from the custom referred to of sowing seed on the marshy soil, and on the top of the water, where there might seem little prospect of a crop and the seed would seem to be lost.

Here Solomon contradicts that vulgar, niggardly principle which imagines that all is lost that is given away for charitable or religious purposes. No, says the Preacher, it is not lost; it is the best investment you can make. The fruit will be found hereafter one hundredfold more than you ever imagined. Therefore, instead of hoarding up that you may save, or lest you should lose, rather give that you may increase. God will be no man's debtor, and will abundantly requite thee, either in this world or the next. Every work and labour of love for the Lord's sake will prove advantageous to ourselves, and what is expended of time and money and labour in God's service will be better secured and bear higher interest than any other property that man possesses. Niggardliness is far removed from godliness. But to return to our text. In Palestine also, during the summer, no rain fell. In the evening of the day the dew fell heavily, and quickly and speedily dried up the next morning. This dew cooled and refreshed the earth and vegetation generally. To this frequent references are made in Holy Scripture. Thus Isaac, in blessing his son Jacob, prayed for him thus: "God give thee of the dew of heaven, and fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine." The fatness of the earth, or its productiveness, its capabilities for producing grass and fruits and herbs for man and beast, depended in a great measure in Palestine upon the dew, which often falls so suddenly and heavily as to wet the unwary traveller to the skin.

The figure of dew is frequently used in Holy Scripture to express and illustrate various phases of religion and spiritual blessings. Thus in Hosea xiv. 5, God says, "I will be as the dew unto Israel." As the dew silently distils on plants and flowers and trees and herbs, refreshing and fructifying them, so God refreshes the souls of His people with grace, making them grow in holiness, usefulness, fruitfulness, amiability, and all goodness.

In the 6th chapter of the same Book of Hosea God complains of His people that "their goodness is as a morning cloud, and as the early dew it goeth away." Their piety was fitful and uncertain, their reformations were partial and shortlived. While smarting under the rod, and influenced by the teachings and warnings of prophets and reforming kings, such as Hezekiah and others, they promised amendment and seemed favourably disposed to repent and turn to God, but they soon lapsed again into old paths. Their goodness had no root or permanence and vanished quickly like the morning cloud or the early dew, like the seed sown on the rock, for a while they seemed to believe and amend, and then fell away. It is to be feared there is much of such spasmodic religion in the world still. Many, under the rod of affliction, under the terrors of conscience, or under the awakening of some revival period, seem deeply impressed and well disposed to religion, and not far from the kingdom. They make, perhaps, a profession of being converted and promise well, and, like the Galatians, seem to "run well" in the heavenly road for a time. But their goodness is only transient; they go back to the world and its ways, and we ask, like the Saviour in reference to the lepers, "Were there not ten cleansed, but where are the nine?" Lost in the great crowd who know not God and obey not the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Their convictions of sin and of the sinfulness of human nature may have been very superficial. They may have resolved to give themselves to God, but resolves are not repentance, and good intentions are not the same thing as regeneration or conversion. Their emotions may have been deeply moved and their feelings strongly excited by revival preaching.

Their tastes and fancies may have been pleased and gratified by the preacher's style, or by reading some treatise on religion. But fanaticism is not faith, and impressions are not piety. Emotions, agitations, and sensibilities of any kind are likely and liable to be deceitful and pernicious where the understanding and conscience do not take the lead. Many have passed through these various phases of experience and seemed deeply interested about religion for a time, but by-and-bye they fall out of the ranks. Their ardour cools, the Bible is less read, the sacredness of the Sabbath is less regarded, the means of grace less valued, prayer neglected, the company of the worldly becomes more congenial, and finally the individual is lost in the crowd and carried along in the rushing tide of human beings who throng the broad road. No more apt figure of such religion could be used than the early dew which so rapidly disappears.

In countries, therefore, such as Palestine, where no rain falls for months in summer, and the heat is very great and accompanied by a dry, scorching wind, which soon dries up all moisture, wells of water are of great value, and in very early times we read of strife between Abimelech and Isaac about a well; and in Deut. vi. 11, Moses reminds the Israelites of God's goodness to them in giving them wells which they digged not. Again, in St. Peter ii. 17, false teachers are likened to wells without water, inasmuch as they bitterly disappoint the hopes of those who hear them, as the mirage, or glowing watery appearance of the sand, disappoints the hopes of the thirsty traveller, who, when he comes to what seemed at a distance to be a lake, finds nothing but burning sand. The language of St. Peter here is very emphatic. Nothing could be more expressive to the mind of people living in those hot, dry countries than to say of religious teachers they were as wells without water. It was always a great disappointment to the parched and thirsty traveller, wearied with his journey, when he came to a well and found it dry. It aggravated and made his trials heavier. So with those who looked to religious teachers to be refreshed with the truths of the Bible, and instead were offered moral essays on metaphysics or philosophy, or the doctrines and commandments of men. The hungry flock were not fed They asked for bread—the bread of life—and were offered a stone. "Feed my sheep," said Jesus to Peter, and also "feed my lambs." So He says still to those who minister in the word and doctrine. He provides the food, it is our parts and duties to distribute it, rightly to divide the Word of Life, and give to each their portion of meat in due season. He Himself is the fountain of living waters; it is ours to direct them and lead them to it. He says, "He that eateth of this bread that I will give him shall live for ever." We say, like the Apostles, "Lord, evermore give us this bread." He says, "He that drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, but it shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." Lord, we come that our thirsty souls may be refreshed and satisfied, that Thy grace may be in our hearts an unfailing fountain springing up into eternal life.

"With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." The language is, of course, figurative, but the meaning is plain. A fountain or spring is used as an emblem of that which refreshes, supports, satisfies, and sustains when men are weary and fainting. And in several passages of Holy Scripture the term is applied to God Himself as the source of all blessing, and as an overflowing fountain fitted to supply the wants of all His creatures. Thus, in Jeremiah xi. 13, Israel is charged with committing two evils: "They have forsaken me," says God, "the fountain of living waters, and hewed out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

God is the source of all felicity, and communicates out of His infinite fulness everything necessary to the present comfort and security and future blessedness and happiness to his people. To this fountain Israel had free and unrestricted access by means of the ordinances which He had appointed. Out of this fountain they might draw, by faith and prayer, the waters of life freely and abundantly. It was always full to overflowing, and yet they were so blinded and foolish as to forsake it, and not only so, but they committed another evil, if possible more foolish and ungrateful still. They tried to do without the Almighty, and turned to idols; but their cisterns of their own contriving were broken, and could hold no water. How many thousands, alas, are still copying the example of Israel and guilty of these twin evils! They forsake the pure Word of God, the fountain of Divine truth and wisdom, and the pure worship of Jehovah, and God's gloriously simple plan of salvation, and try by other means to satisfy their souls and recommend themselves to their offended Creator. Instead of the pure Word of God, they are led away by human teachings and the traditions of men. Instead of the limpid and soul-refreshing and heart-satisfying streams that flow from the great fount of Divine bliss, they drink of the impure, adulterated, and muddy streams of earth. Instead of trusting wholly to the fountain filled with blood to wash away all their guilty stains, they add to it something of human merit. Instead of honouring and recognising God as the spring of all their joys, they try to find satisfaction and happiness from other sources. Instead of joyfully drawing their supplies from the wells of salvation, which are full, satisfying, and free, they seek for satisfaction and happiness from other sources, as wealth, pleasure, philosophy, fame, worldly friendships and pursuits, and are never satisfied, but still have a distressing feeling of want. But he that drinks of the wells of salvation shall never thirst It is not a stagnant pool, but a living spring. It is the water of life, the real

aqua vitæ. "Sir," said the woman to Jesus at Jacob's well, "thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep." Here we have not only a deep well, but an ever-living fountain that plays at all seasons, under all circumstances, in all climes, unaffected by heat or cold, wind or weather. Through all the changing scenes of life it is still the same, eternal in its nature and never failing in supply. Jacob's well was deep In some parts of the world wells are dug shallow at first, and when the drought comes they dry up. Then they send down a man, and he digs still deeper, until he reaches water; but if the rains are long withheld, this also fails and dries up. Then they repeat the process, and dig deeper and deeper, till they come to the living spring. This never fails, no matter what the drought or the weather.

It is all very well for us to sing—

> Lord, I hear of showers of blessing
> Thou art scattering full and free,
> Showers the thirsty land refreshing,
> Let some droppings fall on me.

But "some droppings" are not enough, nor even showers. As long as showers are abundant we may live, but if the showers fail the soil becomes dry and parched and barren. The religion of many is very, very shallow, and so, like the shallow well, when the trying time comes it dries up. and their religious life becomes parched and withered and feeble, like a plant or shrub that can obtain no moisture. Dig deep, send down the shaft until the unfailing fountain is reached and then there will be no intermissions or alternate periods of verdure and barrenness, but with joy shall ye draw water continually out of the wells of salvation. This shallow religion, that has its roots so near the surface, is always an uncertain, fluctuating thing, hovering between life and death. Dig deep, and lay the foundation of your faith broad and deep and strong. Rest it on the Rock of Ages, then it will stand the severest test, and instead of being weak and feeble and decrepit, it will be healthy and vigorous and strong. Instead of having just enough religion to make you restless and apprehensive and unhappy, it will make you bright and glad and happy. "And ye shall draw water with joy out of the wells of salvation." Moses mentions amongst the blessings God had bestowed on Israel "wells which they digged not" (Deut. vi. 11). They succeeded to the labours of others and reaped the harvest others had sown. The whole passage reads thus: "And it shall be, when the Lord thy God shall have brought thee into the land which He sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give the great and goodly cities which thou buildest not, and houses full of all good things, which thou filledst not, and wells digged, which thou diggedst not, vineyards and olive-trees, which thou plantedst not, and when thou shalt have eaten and be full, then beware, lest thou forget the Lord who brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage." Others had laboured, and they entered into their labours. Their danger was great, and their after history shows that the warning to beware of forgetting God and their duty towards Him was not unneeded. I tried to show you some time ago that there were many points of similarity between Israel's history and our own (or the history of our own nation). We, too, are heirs of the wealth of past ages, and drink of wells we digged not. The present is the sum total of the past, and we are now living in the enjoyment of political, social, intellectual, moral and religious advantages handed on to us from past generations by the labours of others. We truly drink of wells that we digged not. We have the happiness to live under the most democratic constitution in the world—a constitution slowly built up by our forefathers from age to age, through many a struggle and many a toil, a constitution that has secured more general freedom and personal liberty than any other on the face of the earth. Our religious liberties and privileges, too, have been preserved for us by others, and handed down to us by our forefathers at the cost of much suffering and blood. Here, again, we have "wells that we digged not," but in the formation of which others spent much toil and treasure. Contributions to our social enjoyment come to us from all countries and climes, while we are the heirs of the intellectual wealth of past ages. For us the historian wrote and the statesman planned, the soldier fought, the scientist investigated, and the theologian preached. The accumulated results of their labours have been passed on to us, and we are all now living in the enjoyment of many blessings that have been procured for us by others. To come nearer home, who built the house in which we live, you and I? Who reclaimed the land of your farms, and planted the trees and made the fences? Who built the schools and the churches, and made the roads, and built the towns and cities, and established the markets, and opened the factories, and accumulated the wealth of the country? Truly the Lord our God has given of this age great and goodly cities which we builded not, and houses full of all good things which we filled not, and wells digged which we digged not, vineyards and olive-trees which we planted not. All these good gifts have come to us directly from our God, and only indirectly and at secondhand from our fathers and forefathers. As the hymn says:—

> All good gifts around us
> Are sent from heaven above,
> Then thank the Lord, O thank the Lord, for all His love.

Wells that we digged not, especially the wells of salvation, are our heritage. In providing salvation we had no share. The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world, and this sending and coming of the Saviour was both unsolicited and unmerited on our part. He Himself opened the fountain for sin and uncleanness without any aid

from us. He now invites all to take the water of life freely. Sin is the prolific parent of all the misery of the universe. But Christ by Himself purged our sins. He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. We had no share in this glorious work. The labours and sufferings were His; the blessings and joys are ours. "If I wash thee not," said Jesus to Peter, "thou hast no part in Me." Then said Peter, "Lord, not my feet alone, but also my hands and my head.

Wash me, and make me thus Thine own;
Wash me, and Mine Thou art.
Wash me, but not my feet alone—
My hands, my head, my heart.

"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," said God to his ancient and erring people, "and with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." The supplies are abundant, satisfying, and free. With joy shall ye draw water. There are sometimes moments of rapture and unwonted joy in the soul's experience when God comes near and makes glorious discoveries of Himself in all the fulness of His grace and boundlessness of His love. Then, as the Apostle says, they are filled with joy unspeakable, and can say of a truth that heaven is begun on earth.

O the pure delight of a single hour
Which before Thy throne I spend,
As I kneel in prayer, and with Thee, my God,
I commune as friend with friend.

The heart glows with love, is filled with peace, and "rejoices in hope of the glory of God. Out of the wells of salvation." The wells in Palestine were often very deep, as much as 160 feet; and if men would be joyful, fruitful, and happy, the roots of their religious life must strike deep in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, and remain constantly in contact with the water of life. The well is deep, but faith can fathom it. The needy and thirsty are many, but there is enough for all, and the invitation is universal, "Whosoever will," and the terms are easy, "Let him take of the water of life freely." Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, that the provision of God's grace is so ample, so accessible, and so satisfying. Lord, we come hungry and thirsty, needy and guilty, just as we are, with our empty vessels, that out of Thy fulness we may receive, and grace for grace.

GOD OUR JOY.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A.

Sermon Preached at St. Peter's Church, Hereford, on Tuesday Evening, October 30th, 1894.

"God my exceeding joy."—Ps. xliii. 4.

In the Prayer Book version the text is rendered "The God of my joy and gladness," but this is a rendering from the Latin, and is not accurate. In the margin of the Authorised Version we have the literal Hebrew—"God the gladness of my joy," or as it is given in another translation "God the joy of my rejoicing." It is a short text, but it has a deep and comprehensive meaning. May the Holy Spirit bring that meaning home to our hearts!

The minister of God's Word has not only to preach positive truth, but to combat prevalent error. It often happens that while men have as it were the truth of God in their hands, the ground is cut from beneath their feet by some practical heresy, so that they cannot enjoy their treasure. Such a practical heresy is the common opinion that religion is a melancholy thing. If by religion is meant a crying for mercy which is never obtained, or the offering of prayers to which an answer is never expected, or the formal observance of certain religious rites and ordinances without any spiritual communion with the Most High, then, indeed, religion is a melancholy thing. But, on the other hand, if religion means contact with the Divine, a realisation of the presence of God, whose glance, though it consumes, yet quickens,* if religion means the sight of Jesus' face and the sympathy of His love, then religion is not a melancholy thing. Nay, it is all joy, all peace, all blessedness. The saints in every age have known it to be such, and the Psalmist in the passage before us utters a universal truth as he cries out to God as "the gladness of his joy."

I.—We may gather from the Psalmist's reminiscences set forth in the passage before us (Ps. xlii. and xliii. being really one Psalm), what is the means of obtaining this highest joy, the worship of God. "I had gone with the multitude," he says, "I went with them to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that kept holyday" (Ps. xlii. 4) To David the exercises of worship were the highest pleasure, while to multitudes they are but a heavy drudgery. What makes the difference? Simply this, that the end of worship is communion with God, and all is shallow and unsatisfying that stops short of this. King David, in his absence and exile from his beloved Jerusalem, longed and thirsted, as he himself tells us, to see God's power and glory, "so as he had seen Him in the sanctuary" (Ps. lxiii. 2). Oh, let this thought fill our mind as we approach God in the offices of devotion, "I am going to see God." This will banish distracting thoughts; this will fix our hearts upon God, and we shall find, as thus we worship Him, that He is "the gladness of our joy." Some years ago, when an Eastern prince visited England, a Christian man was asked if he were going to see his Majesty, but he replied, "No; I am going to see the King of kings to-morrow." In the spirit of those words let us worship God on

* "Consumed, yet quickened, by the glance of God."
Dream of Gerontius.

His holy day, in the sanctuary and in our own homes, and He will indeed prove to us "the joy of our rejoicing."

II.—We gather from the Psalmist's testimony in the passage before us what were the associations of his highest joy, and so learn more of its character. King David is far away from his capital—a fugitive from his home and country, in the region of the Hermons beyond the Jordan. His favourite son Absalom has headed a conspiracy which has now issued in open rebellion, threatening the king's throne and the king's life. Yet even in this dire extremity David can turn to his God and find refuge in prayer to Him. With an intensity of desire, which no language can measure, he longs for Divine help, "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God" (Ps. xlii. 1). True, God seems to have rejected him, and the sense of his ills makes him cry out "Why dost Thou cast me off?" (Ps. xliii. 2). If God were not his joy he would not thus long after him, stripped as he now is of his comforts and banished from his home. The worldling does not come to God in the day of his calamity. Indeed it is just then that he is least inclined to seek Him. But the child of God, though he may lose everything, has God with him still. "My God is my life," said a good man, "I die not but when I lose Him." The Rev. John Newton once called on a pious woman who had lost her house and goods by fire. "I am come," he said, "to congratulate you." "What," she replied, "upon the destruction of my property?" "No," said he, "but to hail you on your possessing property which nothing can destroy."

We see also how King David's joy was associated with the remembrance of God, though by His adverse providence God seemed to disregard him. "I will remember Thee from the land of the Jordan, and of the Hermonites, from the hill Mizar" (Ps. xlii 6). "I will say unto God my rock, Why hast Thou forgotten me?" (Ps. x ii. 9.) Here, again, is illustrated the difference between the false joy of the world and the real joy of the servant of God. The Gadarenes would probably have been pleased to have the Teacher of Nazareth among them, but when His presence brought about the loss of their swine they bade Him begone. Many a professor goes to the house of God and sings His praise in the day of prosperity, but when trouble and loss overshadow his life the sanctuary knows him no more. The true believer, however, remembers God even in the darkest day, knowing that He, and He alone, is the gladness of his joy.

Once again we find King David bidding his soul hope in God in spite of all trial and persecution. He is the hart chased by the hunters, and the hunter seems to be God himself in this overwhelming trouble. He feels like one in a storm at sea, where deep calls to deep at the noise of the waterspouts from above; nay, he sinks beneath his woes, and cries out to God, "All Thy waves and Thy billows are gone over me" (Ps. xlii. 7). In the triumphant rebellion of his beloved son King David beholds the shadow of his own dark sin of days gone by. Yet none of these things move him from his hope, because his chief joy is in God. Even so the believer clings to God when all earthly sources of hope have failed him. And, my brethren, where is your hope, where is your joy? Deprived of your present circumstances and surroundings, could you still turn to God as "the gladness of your joy"? The day will come when by bereavement, by sickness, by death, there will be nothing of joy for you but that which God supplies. I once asked a fair-haired, blue-eyed boy of four years what he needed, and he gave me a wise reply. Listen to it; learn from it. "What do you need?" said I. "God," he answered. Yes, we all need God, you and I; but if we have God we need no more.

III.—The Psalmist also tells us in this place the outcome and issue of his joy in praise. "I shall yet praise Him" (Ps. xlii. 11). He confidently anticipates the day of his restoration, and says, "Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God, my exceeding joy: yea, upon the harp will I praise Thee, O God my God" (Ps. xliii. 4). And so it came to pass, for David at length returned in peace to Jerusalem, and how great then must have been the gladness of his heart as he returned thanks for his deliverance, and praised the Lord for his goodness!

And so is it ever in the experience of the true servant of God. He is continually adding new proofs of God's faithfulness and love to the volume of his experience, because God is the gladness and the very soul of his joy. In himself he is nothing, but in God he is omnipotent and immortal, and he can say with the apostle, "I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me."

In having all things and not Thee, what have I?
Not having Thee, what have my labours got?
If I enjoy but Thee, what further crave I?
And having Thee alone, what have I not?
I wish not sea nor land nor would I be
Possessed of heaven, heaven unpossessed of Thee.

My God, the spring of all my joys,
The life of my delights,
The glory of my brightest days,
And comfort of my nights.

In darkest shades if He appear
My dawning is begun,
He is my soul's sweet morning-star
And He my rising sun.

The opening heavens around me shine
With beams of sacred bliss,
While Jesus shows His heart is mine
And whispers I am His.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1895.

EASTER OFFERINGS.

IF the clergy, as a body, could admit any argument for disendowment, it might be this, that under the purely voluntary principle they would probably be better paid. It is a melancholy fact that the average Anglican priest may anticipate no better prospect than that of being "passing rich" on something less than £200 per annum. His education at school and college has not cost less than £1,000, and in many cases twice that amount. His hours are those of a country doctor, his professional duties require more than a dash of all the arts and most of the sciences. If he is not a scholar, he is pitied; if he is not an orator, he is blamed; if he is not an essayist, he is poked fun at; if he is not a man of business, he is derided; if he has no presence, he is caricatured. He is expected to be tactful and sympathetic, of good critical ability, a bit of an artist, and a bit more of an architect, a disciplinarian capable of managing both sexes at all ages; and in return for all this, unless he is exceptionally lucky and privileged with unusual influence, he is fortunate if he earns a wage not equal to that of a second-rate professional cricketer, or the head waiter of a seaside commercial hotel. The endowments of the Church serve to conceal the miserably underpaid condition of the clergy. The laity are unused to contributing in actual cash down to the support of their parish priests, and have got to think it unnecessary. They contentedly regard them struggling to keep up appearances, and to discharge charitable duties, on incomes which would be held totally inadequate for members of any other profession.

It is useless to ask why people should suppose that a clergyman ought to be able to live with ease upon an income which they themselves would contemptuously dismiss as inadequate for their own needs. The fact is inexplicable, but obvious. An ordinary solicitor, of no conspicuous abilities, who never took a scholarship or won a college prize, thinks himself poorly rewarded with from £600 to £1,000 a year. The vicar of his parish, who in all probability got the scholarships and the prizes and a high degree to boot, thinks himself, and is thought, blessed above his fellows if he gets less than half. So great is the difference, in the estimation of the world, between the services of the lawyer and the parson. The same is true of all ranks. The average income of a bishop is about £3,500 a year, and it is a fact, extracted from a bishop's own account book, that the net value of the income, when the responsibilities of the see are discharged, is about £500. Now what first-class solicitor or leading Q.C. would be content even with the gross income of a bishop? It is the case that counsel of the first rank look askance even upon the £5,000 of a judge, and £10,000 is roughly assumed by the country to be the equivalent of the sacrifice made by barristers in accepting the duties of law officers of the Crown. And yet it is acknowledged on all hands that a bishop is, at the very least, not inferior in intellectual gifts and scholarly acquirements to eminent barristers and solicitors. Indeed, the record of a bishop is generally superior and his work certainly as hard. The only explanation is that for many centuries the laity have been familiar with the tradition of endowments, and they accepted a position which relieved themselves of responsibility. Once sufficient, always sufficient is the idea. People who have never been in the habit of paying the parson never will pay the parson, and in the end the poor parson is hardly paid at all.

Lately an opportunity has arisen of striking a blow at this mischievous tradition, and of slightly improving the desperate condition of the clergy by reviving the custom of Easter dues and offerings. The Prayer-book distinctly encourages, if it does not absolutely enjoin, the weekly collection, a primitive and Scriptural practice. And a chief purpose of these collections is, plainly, the support of the clergy. This is indicated by the recitation in the offertory of the strongest of those passages in which St. Paul insists upon the right of those who preach the Gospel to live of the Gospel. The opinion of the highest authorities on ecclesiastical law endorses this. They give the support of the clergy a high place among the "pious and charitable uses" to which the offerings of the faithful are to be devoted. It is not only the right, but it is the duty of Churchwardens, who are not autocratic in the matter, to see that the claims of the clergy are not overlooked. The laws of the Church are not observed by draining the parish of comparatively

huge sums for outside purposes, while the parish priest is hampered by poverty, perhaps struggling with an inevitable load of debt, or sinking, through financial pressure, below the position which he ought to occupy. That at least the Easter offerings should be devoted to the relief and support of the ministry is only common justice. However small the total realised, it would be at least an admission on the part of the parishioners of their obligation to their spiritual guides. And thus the way would be paved towards a better state of things, when people would gradually learn that the clergy are not less deserving than any other body of professional men, and that services cheerfully and loyally rendered ought not to be grudgingly repaid, or suffered to go unpaid altogether. On their part the clergy would feel that their work was not altogether unappreciated, and even a trifling token of regard would carry its message of encouragement and hopefulness.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Christ's peaceful reign (Isaiah ii. 1-9). Introduction.—Let us look at a few lessons from this subject:—1. Christ's kingdom a firm and glorious one. 2. Christ's reign what nations need. 3. Christ's power unlimited. 4. Christ's authority cannot be overturned. 5. Christ will take care of His Church and people. 6 Christ's kingdom and people are safe and have no fear. The prophet Isaiah is foretelling the coming of Christ's kingdom. It is very encouraging and consolatory for the Church of God to meditate and consider what will be the ultimate results to God's Church and people. There is nothing whatever for them to fear; for although many things, until the end of this despensation, will take place which may be terrible in the subsequent history and end of the world, yet the promises of God to His Church and people will never be overturned, and amid the commotions which may be in store God's people are secure. The time is coming when the reign of Christ will bring peace to all nations, and those that render homage to Him will then see He is worthy, and He will ultimately reign until He hath put all enemies under His feet.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

THE Church Army, whose friends held a meeting at Stafford House the other day, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duchess of Teck being among the company, is just now being rather sharply criticised in some of the Church papers. The principal allegation is that the officers employed are, for the most part, converted Dissenters, and they have little knowledge of or sympathy with Church principles. Mr. Carlile is, no doubt, attempting a difficult task in his effort to work with all parties in the Church, but he has so far succeeded better than could be anticipated. We hardly think that the argument of Mr. Clifford, the lay head of the organisation, at the Stafford House meeting, that working men are the best missionaries to working men, will be generally endorsed by those best competent to form an opinion. It is not consistent with the experience of the University and Public School Missions, and a lay-worker of long standing in London is of opinion that young University men who possess zeal according to knowledge are the most efficient helpers among the lowest classes.

THE MAKING OF MIND.

PART II.

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific address on Wednesday, April 3rd, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., observed:—

Human nature is threefold, and our body, soul, spirit, are developed by an Eternal Energy resident in the universe; and by this Divine intelligence the wells of truth in men are filled to overflowing, for replenishment of the earth. The point of life in which our structure begins seems in matter and force the attractive particle of our whole being, beginning and continuing the multiplying of itself. It also contains the unsolved mystery of our general growth and of our particular character. It makes and unites body and mind, but no more explains life than our brain unfolds the marvel of mind.

Our anatomy is strange, our mental composition stranger. We are a sort of museum with material and mental curiosities, belonging in part to heredity, with things new strangely blended. We are furnished from a long-continued process gathering representative parts from all precedent life and mind. Our awaking into human nature is well regarded to have been a sudden brightening, a new revelry of life.

Mind and body represent all physical material and force in union with mental power. We have the universe in a nutshell. The marvel is not lessened by this, but magnified. Spiritual force is not less real, and far more wonderful, than bodily force. Bodily force makes or gives concrete form to our structure. Spiritual force represents all that is mentally beautiful, creative, moral, in our soul. The two are not one and the same. The mental contains the potentiality of five great knowledges—material, vital, sensitive, intellectual, moral. Interpret ourselves, and we interpret the universe.

To exemplify with material instruments for these various knowledges, the brain contains about four thousand eight hundred millions of fibres. The wisest man does not use to the fullest, even a small part, of this material equipment; but as no part is in vain, it proves that preparation has been made for our well-nigh infinite advance. He, in truth, is wisest who counts this life as best in preparing him to be best here, and counted worthiest of remembrance as complete in every part.

Body and mind are not two aspects of one and the same thing. Matthew Buckinger, with no legs, nor feet, nor hands, nor arms, was a far cleverer man, and did more artistic work than any man chosen out of a thousand.

We build up the mind by pleasant thoughts working out intellectual and moral problems. We weaken the mind by evil, godless, devilish thoughts; they generate a poison more deadly than those we extract from material substances. This is no a figment to alarm the timid. The poisons are detected in the secretions and excretions. As we advance in knowledge and use of ourselves as responsible beings, we imbibe of the wisdom and power of the Spirit in the universe, enlarge our mind by the revelation of mind there, discern that there is in us a signature of the Eternal, become sure that the majestic drama of creation will not pass into a weak ending, but into a harmony and life of greater splendour.

THE CHURCH IN WALES AND THE WELSH PEOPLE.

By the Right Rev. Dr. LLOYD, Bishop of Bangor.

Delivered in St. Michael's, Cornhill, on Monday Afternoon, February 25th, 1895, being the Fifth of a Series of Lectures on Establishment and Endowment.

"The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and sowed in his field."—Matt. xiii. 31.

YOU have no time at your disposal this morning to listen to an attempt to trace even in rough outline the rise and growth of Christianity in Britain, and more especially in Wales. I therefore go on to observe at once that towards the close of the sixth century of the Christian era there is evidence to show that the Church in Wales was an organised Church, with dioceses formed and with their boundaries fairly marked out, following in the main the several divisions into which the Principality had been at that time separated. And it is worthy of notice that at this period in the history of the Church in Wales we know that a great outburst of religious revival stimulated the Church of the time into new and fresh life, finding its consummation not in the mere excitement of what may be called Corybantian howls, but the establishment of great monastic institutions or religious houses such as Bangor-y-scoed, Bangor Hawr, Llancanfair, Llanvadarn, Vawr, and others, which I need not enumerate. And we know that at a later period these monastic institutions or these houses became the centres of educational activity, centres into which students flowed from all parts of Great Britain, and also from the Continent of Europe, and that they continued to flourish and exercise their religious educational influence down to the accession of Norman rule. Two questions of considerable importance relating to this first period of the British Church suggest themselves—first, the origin of its Christianity; second, its independence of Roman influence. It has been contended that the Celtic Church springs from an Eastern stem, that it is Greek in its character, and doctrine, and customs. But two well-known historians insist on the groundlessness of the alleged Eastern origin of the early British Church—Eastern in no other sense than that its Christianity originated in Asia, and found its way to Britain through Gaul without imprinting one single trace on the British Church itself of anything which can be regarded as peculiarly Greek, or Oriental, or Eastern. In its origin, then, we say that the British Church has nothing to do with Rome, and we know that for many centuries it continued to act without reference to the domination of that omnipotent See. Indeed, we may say, as it has been well said, "That freedom of self-government was accorded to the native Welsh Church of almost all dates, and was diminished gradually with the reign of Edward, who brought English law to bear on the subject side by side with his gradual and attempted Anglocising of Wales." There is no time for me this morning to show how in many customs the Church in Wales at this period differed very considerably indeed from those which prevailed in the Catholic Church in other countries, and how obstinately the Church in Wales fought against the alteration of these customs, and with what ill grace it finally conceded them. But the point I am aiming at is this, that we are justified in claiming that the Church in Wales is the mother Church of the country, and that from it has sprung up the numerous sects and denominations which to-day claim the allegiance and homage of Welshmen. If any institution in the land has a right to be called a native institution, it is the Church in Wales that has this right. And yet this is the Church that we are told day after day is an alien Church, a Church forced on the people from without, whereas it is *the* Church that has its roots entwined around the life and habits and sentiments of the native population of the Principality.

THE CHURCH AS A GARRISON.—I go on to the Norman period. At that date the Welsh Church was a power in the land, and was making its influence felt throughout the country, and was devoting its energy very largely indeed to the mental cultivation and education of the people. But the imposition of Norman rule crushed out its life, and the Church became the appendage of the Norman Castle. The lament of the old Welsh chronicler is truly pathetic: "Dar fu dysg adawn mei bron Cymru"—"Perished the learning and the gifts of the Sons of Cambria." With the oppression of the sons of the soil the Church sank also, for under such adverse circumstances no Church could thrive, for the Church must be presented to the people in a form not alien from the national sentiment. "It was reserved," says an old historian, "for the Norman to use the Church as a garrison in a hostile country, to initiate the policy of alien intrusion, to strike at Welsh nationality, by controlling the ecclesiastical as well as the political destinies of the people, and to carry out this policy with characteristic vigour. From the twelfth to the end of the fifteenth century the high places of the Church were filled by ecclesiastics ignorant of the language of the people, without sympathy with the Welsh character, wanting in that personal influence which is so essential for Welsh popular leaders, and representing the domination of an alien race among a people in whom burned the fire of national independence."

THE RESTORATION OF NATIONALITY.—With the Reformation a new era dawned on the oppressed Welsh Church. The old order was changed to give place to new, and possibly the Welsh origin of the Tudor sovereign may have contributed something towards bringing about this desirable change. So vigorously had the Welsh language maintained itself that it was felt absolutely necessary both by ecclesiastical and political statesmen of the day to have the Word of God translated into Welsh, and this translation of the Bible made, as it was, by one of the Welsh bishops, Bishop Morgan, assisted by many other eminent ecclesiastics of the day, not only gave a fresh stimulus to the Welsh language, without which, perhaps, it would have died, but helped to fan afresh the flame of Welsh national sentiment. And upon the production of this Welsh translation of the Bible there followed a very large number of books of devotion in the Welsh language, partly translated and partly original, which exercised at that particular period a very beneficial influence upon the Welsh heart. For about one hundred and fifty years the Welsh Church was governed by men of eminent learning, by men in sympathy with the national stirrings, and the consequence was that the people rallied round the Church once more, and became the

staunchest of Churchmen and the loyalist of loyalists; and the movement expended itself, not in mere ecclesiastical activities only, but took a decided educational turn, and grammar schools and elementary schools were founded, acting as the pioneers of the educational energy of the latter half of the nineteenth century. I may state here, in passing, what has been done by the Welsh Church through the agency mainly of one Welsh clergyman, the Rev. Griffith Jones, of Llanddowror. In the middle of last century, aided by many other clergymen of the Principality and by many of our brethren from England, this one clergyman, who lived in Caermarthenshire, in South Wales, taught 150,000 people, partly children and partly adults, to read the Bible, which had been translated into their own language. He started a system of what are called circulating schools. The school remained in one parish for three or four months, and then moved on to another parish for three or four months, and so spread a regular network of education throughout the whole Principality; and by the energy which he threw into the work something like 150,000 native Welsh people were taught to read the Bible in their own tongue.

A Period of Gloom.—With the revolution another cloud overshadowed the Principality. Big with gloom, and pregnant with issues untold, the old system was revived. Bishops and priests, ignorant of the language of the people, were thrust upon an indignant and reluctant people. The bishops lived but little in the country, and some dared not set foot in the place. The clergy were largely non-resident for many reasons which I cannot describe; and curates "passing rich on forty pounds a year" did their duty. The teaching from the pulpit was dry and unconventional, as it was in England too, I believe; and a celebrated Welsh clergyman, whom I have already quoted, says that the people dissented at first from the Church for no other reason than for want of plain, practical, zealous preaching in a language and dialect they were able to understand. There was no life, no spirit, no endeavour. But again a fresh wave passed over the land—a wave of Evangelical revival set rolling in England. Here and there clergymen arose who had drunk deep of the new spirit, and endeavoured to satisfy the wants of the age within the pale of the Church. Opposed, I am afraid, by the whole strength of the Church at the time, they were gradually forced to other channels and to adopt other methods. It is difficult to gauge the force of any popular movement at the moment of its rising, and I am not prepared to say that, if Welsh-speaking bishops had been ruling at the time when the Evangelical upheaval took place, they would have directed the movement within the channels of the Church, and prevented the great schism from becoming a fact. To us, as we look back upon the history of this new departure, it appears, indeed, strange that the eyes of the men of those were not able to discern in the movement the deep stirring of the hearts of the people; but to them the religious outburst seemed to be but the temporary fanaticism of a few sectaries, and they looked upon it as a mere passing disturbance of the nation's temper. A revival which began within the Church itself was diverted into other channels, partly, I think, by the inelasticity of the Church system, and partly by the blindness of the ecclesiastical rulers of the day, and became the seed of our numerous dissensions and divisions and of the separation of class from class, and that which ought to have acted as a purifying and exalting power within the Church itself became a formidable power and influence outside it, and finally terminated in 1811 in the formal separation of the Calvinist Methodist body from the Church of their forefathers to which they had been hitherto attached. But from 1840 downwards, more or less coincident with the great Tractarian movement inaugurated at Oxford, a fresh spirit was infused year by year into the Church in Wales, and that spirit has become to-day a living energy, permeating certainly every town area, and gradually leavening even the remote hill country districts. We are now living in a transitional period, the exact issues of which none can tell.

The Church's Best Defence.—The tide is beginning to flow strongly and steadily in our favour, and I believe that every educational advancement is strongly on the side of our National Church. But I own that the Church must justify her existence, her national existence, not only in Wales, but also in England, not so much by the number of her adherents as by the energy and the vitality which she is able to throw into every cause which maketh for righteousness. There is, I believe, a widespread feeling among many of our Nonconformist friends in Wales that there is something lacking in their system. And what is this? Is it not a feeling that they have separated from the true vine? Is it not a longing to be once more incorporated into the body of Christ? There is nothing in the doctrine of the Church, there is hardly anything in the liturgy of the Church, to which the most rigid Welsh Nonconformist would not subscribe. And the more forcibly we bring home to our people the great truth that the Church, after all, is not a mere social club, but a great educational institution, overshadowed by the constant presence of its Divine Founder, the stronger will grow her hold upon our countrymen. To the world, however, the Church is known by her representatives through her clergy and laity. Her ministers and her laymen and laywomen must feel a sense of the responsibility for the great charge committed to their care. They must throw themselves into the needs and wants of the day. Privileges, honour, self-aggrandisement, soul corroding jealousies, and sectarian narrownesses and bitternesses must be flung to the wild winds to scatter. Against these let us set up the idea of self-sacrifice, and as the image of the Son of Man giving Himself for the life of the world has ever been the great lever-force of Christianity, so the same spirit manifested in ourselves to-day will work miracles even in this our day of trial.

There are signs of life and indications of growth around us on every side. Look around, and you will see an awakening in every parish in our country. There are signs on the distant horizon that beckon us onward in true and constant faith. In spite of cruel criticisms to which every effort is exposed, in spite of much bitterness of feeling which, I wish to God, we could but allay, let us go on inspired with new zeal to work more honestly and more faithfully for the weal and the welfare of those entrusted to our charge. Thus acting, thus living, thus feeling we may hope yet to grow in one strong brotherhood, bound together by the strongest of all bonds—the love of Christ crucified.

The Church and Welsh Nationality.—I must, before I finish, point out one or two great errors which are made with regard to our Church and

which are pointed out continually. It is commonly said that in Wales it is only the Nonconformist body that ministers to the people in their own language. No greater mistake can possibly be made. I may say that in my own diocese there are three parishes where Welsh is not habitually spoken by the people, but there is not a single parish in my diocese where the clergyman or minister of the parish is not capable of ministering to the Welsh people in their own language quite as well and as fluently as any Nonconformist minister in the country. In my diocese, I say, there is not a single clergyman placed over a parish who is not perfectly familiar with the Welsh language and fairly familiar also with the English tongue. It is true that in most of our parishes we have English services, and the bi-lingual difficulty is a difficulty that crushes us down to the very ground. But I wish to disabuse you of that idea which is so prevalent that the Welsh Church does not minister to the Welsh people. I cannot this morning enter into any of the statistics of the question It would be out of place; but I may say that in my own cathedral city, with a population of nine or ten thousand, we have about eight hundred communicants, last Easter Sunday little over five hundred of whom communicated in the Welsh language. There are other points which I should like to mention. It is commonly said that we are against the educational progress of the people. I must say here that there is not a word of truth in that. I am myself doing everything in my power by acting on the governing bodies of the new schools that have lately been founded to further the cause of education amongst our people. I have seen it said again and again in the public press that the Church is putting all her machinery in action against this educational wave that is passing over the country. I am bound to say here with all solemnity that there is not one atom of truth in such a misrepresentation as that. I would say but one thing in closing—that if our Church ceases to be a National Church, still the divisions which have appeared amongst us will not cease. It is a common statement that if the Church ceases to hold a national position, all differences and all dissensions will immediately disappear. But there is no body to take its place. The Nonconformists are split into fragments, and there is a greater attachment, I am quite sure, on the part of the other sects to the Church than there is on the part of any one sect to another sect. If you destroy our Church, then, I say, there is no other body that can take its place, and that can succeed it. If you kill it you will deal a fatal blow—well, I will not say a fatal blow, but you will deal a fell if not a fatal blow—at the very existence of Christianity amongst us. You will leave to our posterity a heritage of strife, and contention, and bitterness, which I venture to say, though I am sorry to confess it, it will take generations, aye, centuries, of the most loving work and care to heal and to allay.

THE death of Dr. Payne Smith, of whose work, prolonged till he was nearly seventy-seven, nobody has anything but what is good to say, places a fifth deanery at Lord Rosebery's disposal. Ripon is not yet filled, so far as we know, the report current a few days ago in Yorkshire that Canon Barker had been appointed not having been confirmed or authoritatively contradicted. It is possible that the Queen's absence from England accounts for the delay of the announcement.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DR. FRY'S SERMON.

SIR,—I crave leave to make a few remarks on the curious sermon of Dr. Fry in to-day's PULPIT.

When a man speaks of a subject he ought to know something about it. Dr. Fry is evidently ignorant of economic science, as one expression that he uses is sufficient to show. "We need," he says, "new Christian economics of consumption." Economics of consumption is a term inconsistent with the existence of a science of economics at all; and Christian economics means as much or as little as Christian astronomy.

Dr. Fry is as ignorant of the actual facts of economics as he is of the science itself and its terminology. He speaks of persons "legally entitled to a first charge upon some portion of the national dividend before a single worker . . can eat his breakfast." Here, the national dividend means the sum of the incomes of all members of the nation. Take one item of this, myself, for instance, the possessor of some dividend-paying railway stock. I am paid my dividends half-yearly, after they have been earned; the workmen employed on the railway are paid their wages weekly or monthly, before it is ascertained what dividend, if any, is to be paid me. Again, Dr. Fry says, "There is not an idle man . . . that is not definitely adding to the toil and sorrow of the working world." I do not see that this is so, and I am pretty sure that Dr. Fry cannot tell definitely how it is so. If it be thus with an idle man, it must be so also with a ward in Chancery, whom, I suppose, Dr. Fry would leave at peace.

Again, "The huge fortune that has piled itself out of social labour without so much as building, much less endowing, one single public benefit." Again, "Sixteen millions a year is paid for the right to live upon the soil of London, nearly every farthing, if not every farthing, of which value is created by the combined labour of those who pay it." Let me take a case, say, of a man who has made a vast sum by manufacturing calico. Calico is made of cotton; a pound of cotton costs sixpence; a pound of calico is sold for a shilling. What the manufacturer has got or saved in the process of making the calico has made his fortune. How has he piled it up out of *social labour*, whatever that is? If Dr. Fry means that the manufacturer ought to have paid his workmen and women more wages than he did, is not some other social reformer as well entitled to say that there are equally good claims on the part of the producer of the cotton that went with the help of the workpeople to make the calico? Ninety-nine out of a hundred of these large fortunes have been really made out of the brains of those who have made the fortunes. And those who have made those fortunes have, by so doing, conferred benefits on the public. They have increased the capital, which can, and which does, employ further labour, and, by increased demand for that labour, does increase its price. The sixteen millions of London ground rents (I had really thought it is a good deal more) is not value created by labour. Labour creates no value. Labour assists in the making of things out of natural products, which are made because they are

expected to be of value. Value is created or caused by demand, which is the only economic force. This sixteen millions a year of value is caused by the demand of those who want the land to build houses upon, exactly as the value of a loaf of bread is caused by the demand of those who want to eat bread.

"Monopolists of land and capital, legally their own." There is the excuse of some out-of-date authorities which may be advanced to justify speaking of the monopoly of land, while there is not, and never was, such a monopoly. But that any man that reads a newspaper, and knows in even the most superficial way the present state of the money market, should talk about the monopoly of capital, is evidence of a state of intelligence that I cannot account for.

Dr. Fry gives some statistics that I will not accept on his authority, nor on any authority that does not fully explain how the results are arrived at. He speaks of "the workers severed from capital and paid only by wages." When he wrote this curious sentence, was he taking the trouble to think even a very little? Workers have always been paid in wages or in money and orders on tommy shops. What they think best for themselves is to get all in money. They are severed from capital as they always have been severed from it; that is, if *severed* is a correct term to describe the relation of buyer and seller, which I do not think it is.

So much for Dr. Fry's knowledge of economics, which if zero implies nothing, is a good way below that point. His knowledge of jurisprudence is on a par. I find on close examination that he uses, throughout his sermon, "law," and "legal," and "legally," with invidious implication. "Legal rights," he says, "are not even the expression of conscience in the past," etc. To set him right in this and in his view of law in general, I refer him to the first book of the Eccesiastical Polity, which a Doctor of Divinity ought to be acquainted with. I refer him to a greater than Hooker—Moses, who said by Divine inspiration, among other precepts, "Thou shalt not steal." I refer him to all physical science, which is the knowledge of the laws of the natural world, of which laws God is the Maker. And I would refer him to economic science, the laws of which are also of Divine appointment, based as they are on the constitution of man's nature, and on arithmetic, were it not to every appearance hopeless so to refer him.

I would end this letter here but for a consideration that I have not alluded to above. If Dr. Fry had told his audience that all men are responsible to God for the uses which they make of their worldly goods as of all other talents wherewith He has endowed them, that they are stewards and not proprietors, and as stewards have duties, he would have been right. But he has chosen to virtually lay down instead of this, that, according to right, men who have wealth of any sort or in any amount beyond, or a little beyond the average, are responsible to their fellows who may, or may not, have assisted them in the gaining of that wealth, and who have been honestly paid wages in cases of that assistance, for their uses of that wealth. This is putting the responsibility on a low ground. Even Paley saw that when he described the man who keeps his fist closed against the demands of brotherly love because he pays poor rates. Our laws have made, in that one attempt to carry out the responsibility of the use of wealth as a responsibility towards man, and not towards God, a dismal failure. The Socialists, whom Dr. Fry preached to, hate law, but want to turn it to their purposes. Probably their failure will be more entire than that of the poor law. It has been so in every instance in which their methods have been tried.

But Dr. Fry has done more than lay down this right of men or the community of men. He has enforced this right not by reasons but with threats. And he has appealed not to lawlessness merely—hatred of law is lawlessness—but he has appealed also to envy and covetousness, the basest passions by which men are misled, and the parents of most crimes that men commit.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

March 30th.

"WHAT WE KNOW OF GOD BY REASON APART FROM SCRIPTURE."

SIR,—The Rev. Prebendary J. W. Reynolds in his "scientific" lecture has the following remarks attributed to him (PULPIT, March 23rd, p. 140):—"It is silly to talk about plants selecting; fishes, birds, beasts selecting, sexual selection, and natural selection. There is nothing of the kind. . . . To refuse the highest title to God and then pretend to confer on birds and beasts the power of adaptation bears the stamp of folly."

There are two views of the origin of species held by biologists, one called "Darwinism," which maintains that *the origin of species is by means of natural selection*. The other view holds that plants and animals vary in response to a changed environment, putting themselves (or else their offspring do it) in harmony with their altered surroundings, by what may be called *the power of self-adaptation without the aid of natural selection.*

The Prebendary appears to condemn alike both these supposed methods of evolution. There is apparently no third method, unless it be the "special creation" hypothesis of the older teleologists. His remark, "An efficient cause accomplishing a purposed result" seems to imply that he still adopts that exploded hypothesis.

Is it not rather "silly" to charge Darwinists with the belief that plants and animals "select," since Darwin himself never hinted at such a preposterous idea, except in the very limited application of sexual selection, nor does any existing Darwinist hold it? Is it not "folly" to condemn the power of adaptation when thousands of proofs surround us on every side in nature, and in our gardens and farms, if one does but choose to look for them, as many do—though the Prebendary may not—who by no means "refuse the highest title to God," among whom may be included the present writer? On the contrary, he would recognise the infinite power and goodness of the Creator in having endowed His creatures, plants and animals, with such a marvellous power of self-adaptation as they possess; so that when they are transferred to a different soil, climate, etc., they can adapt themselves to it, and so develop new varieties, species and genera, in course of time, and always in harmony with their surroundings. Whence, *e.g.*, have all our culinary vegetables come from, say the whole of the cabbage tribe, unless it be by adaptation to a garden soil? They do not exist wild, nor do our sheep and oxen. Surely this may teach man, by analogy, one of the highest moral

lessons to be learnt on earth, namely, self-adaptation to his duties and responsibilities, instead of rebelling against them.

GEORGE HENSLOW.

TRANSIT OF CATTLE AND PUBLIC SLAUGHTER-HOUSES.—Mr. Herbert Gardner, President of the Board of Agriculture, received on Thursday, the 4th inst., two memorials from a deputation of the Church Society for the Promotion of Kindness to Animals, and the Church Sanitary Association. The first memorial asked the President to aid in securing amended legislation in respect of slaughter-houses, and was signed by the Archbishop of York, as President of the two Societies, and 2,752 persons. The second memorial, which was signed by the Bishop of Lichfield, the Earl of Airlie, Lady Frederick Cavendish, Canon Scott-Holland, and others, asked that the recommendations contained in the report of the Coast-wise Transit of Cattle Committee be extended to the carriage of cattle by land, as well as by sea; and that in conjunction with the Local Government Board a joint Departmental Committee of Enquiry be instituted by which might be brought about, on the one hand, the betterment of the condition of animals generally, and on the other hand the improved health of the human community, as the result of improved conditions of meat supplies, such inquiry to include (1) the slaughtering of animals locally under conditions where there could be supervision, by competent authorities appointed by the Board of Agriculture, of the methods of killing, and of the fitness of the flesh of such animals for human food, so as to render unnecessary the carriage of animals for long distances for purposes of slaughter; (2) the improving of existing arrangements for the conveyance of meat from agricultural districts to centres of population; (3) the provision of places under Local Authorities where meat can be stored at low temperatures, so as to avoid the waste of useful food and to prevent the sale to poor persons of meat which has become unwholesome from conditions of climate; and (4) the foundation of travelling scholarships by the Government to enable veterinary students to enlarge their knowledge and experience by visiting foreign schools to study meat inspection in those countries where meat cannot be used for human food until approved after competent veterinary inspection. Sir Benjamin Richardson, in introducing the Deputation, said that their aim was to abolish private slaughter-houses, and establish public ones near the market places on the various railway lines. Dr. Norman Kerr said that the better the animals were in health the more wholesome their flesh was for food. Canon Wilberforce said that private slaughter-houses were unavoidably associated with torture and agony. Mr. Gardner, in reply, said that the object they all had at heart was to make the treatment of animals as kindly as possible. One of the most important matters he had to consider was the action of the local authorities, who, generally speaking, lagged behind the central authority in opinion. It ought to be the object of Societies like theirs to educate public opinion, and he hoped they would do so, and thus aid them in the work they had to do. He was glad to see that they had waited on the Minister of Education, because the cruelty they deplored was largely owing to the insensibility of ignorance. He would take into consideration what had been submitted to him, and hoped that, in concert with the various departments concerned, a satisfactory result might be arrived at.

THE Rev. W. Lancelot Holland, incumbent of St. Thomas's English Episcopal Church, Edinburgh, and formerly vicar of All Saints', Hatcham Park, has determined to sever his connection with the Church of England, an announcement which will not be surprising to those who know him. In a letter to the senior trustee of St. Thomas's, he says he is unable with a good conscience to adhere to the forms of worship and Church government in the Church. He adds:—"My mind is also influenced by the sad condition the Church of England is now in. The system of patronage, whereby congregations are having men thrust upon them as ministers who act and teach contrary to the Word of God, the Protestantism of the Church, and the wishes of the people, is enough to stamp the Church as very far removed from Apostolic custom and simplicity." We do not yet hear whether Mr. Holland intends to join any existing religious body, or to start one of his own.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Lang, Rev. A. H., Missionary in Kurdistan; Organising Secretary of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians.

Stephenson, Rev. John Parnaby, Vicar of Prior's Lee; Surrogate for the Diocese of Lichfield.

Swallow, Rev. William, M.A.; Rector of Weston Favell Northampton.

Taylor, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of St. Mary's, Lower Ince, Wigan; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deanery of Wigan.

Thorp, Rev. W. Paxton; Rector of Little Yeldham, Halstead, Essex.

Treglown, Rev. John Samuel, B.A.; Vicar of Deopham, Norfolk.

Tucker, Rev. J. Savile, M.A., Assistant-Master of Wellington College; Head Master of Trent College, Notts.

Turnbull, Rev. Thomas Michael, B.A., Curate; Vicar of New Mill, Huddersfield.

Tweed, Rev. E. M., M.A., Head Master of Spalding Grammar-school; Chaplain of Wykeham, Spalding.

Ward, Rev. Charles Fenwick, M.A., Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the North-West District; Vicar of the Albert Memorial Church, Manchester.

Wilson, Rev. O. Haydock, Missionary to East Indian Immigrants; Curate of St. Paul's-cum-St. Clement's, Wakenaam, Essequibo, B.G.

Yonge, Rev. Charles F. Lysaght; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Norwich, Rural Deanery of Wilford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bean, Rev. Alexander Louis Wellington, M.A., for forty-three years Vicar of Sowerby, near Halifax, at Sowerby Vicarage, on the 30th ult., aged 79.

Buckle, Rev. Godfrey Edward, at Ashperton, on the 30th ult., aged 42.

Firmin, Rev. John Palmer, thirty-seven years Rector of Eaton, and fifty years in the Parish of Astbury, at Eaton Rectory, Congleton, on the 4th inst., aged 81.

Grantham, Rev. Herbert Alfred, Rector of Halton, on the 1st inst., aged 49.

Hale, Right Rev. Mathew Blagden, D.D., Bishop, formerly of Perth, Western Australia, and subsequently of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, at Beaufort-road, Clifton, on the 3rd inst., aged 83.

Lyons, Rev. Ponsonby A., formerly Curate of Dorrha, on the 24th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DREAM OF REUNION.

By the Very Rev. GEORGE A CHADWICK, D.D., Dean of Armagh.

Delivered to the Grindelwald Conference, July 30th, 1894.

"Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak: and He will show you things to come."—John xvi. 13. R.V.

THESE words are familiar to us all. They occur just after Jesus had announced that, although He had many things to say to His disciples for which they were not prepared, yet the loss would not be for ever, for when the Spirit of truth was come He would lead them along the road into all truth. Hereupon He adds the strange reason, "For He shall not speak from Himself." Let us pause for a moment to consider how strong a light this passage throws upon the mystery of the Divine Nature. It would be vapid and a platitude, if all agnosticism were not a denial of it, to say that we may look, and learn much by looking, into truths of which we may never fathom the abysses; just as in the desolate ice-fields which overhang us while we speak your eye may follow down the intense blue walls of some huge crevasse, although the utmost ray flashed back from sharp needle-points of ice far into the deep does not announce that profounder gulfs lie undiscerned below. And yet what you do see is a reality, and to ignore it is the dullest and most incurious apathy.

So may we here discern something surely not erroneous, both of the Holy Spirit and of our Lord. We see that the Spirit of truth is no mere influence, but intensely masculine and personal; nor does even our English version, "He the Spirit," more than represent the energy wherewith, in the immediate context, three times over Christ applied to the Spirit, which is a word in the neuter, as a fitting pronoun, not "it," but "He" (ἐκεῖνος) "He shall convict the world of sin." "He—the Spirit—shall guide you into all the truth." "He shall glorify Me." No emphasis could be more imperious, and it is only fair to ask the impugners of Catholic doctrine how they account for a phenomenon so important, so fraught with import, as this triple and deliberate expression of our Lord.

Again, if they will have it that the Spirit is only a Divine influence, while the Redeemer is something—anything—less than Divine, how is it conceivable that this illuminating influence from God should speak not from Himself, but by taking what belongs to a creature in such wise that the glory should be His? "Who, then, is Paul? or who is Apollos?" said the greatest of the apostles. "He shall glorify Me"—the Divine Spirit shall not speak of Himself, "but shall take of Mine," said the Nazarene. And His self-assertion, which is characteristic and common to the Meek and Lowly One in all the Gospels, has been so effective that for nineteen centuries the Church, obeying His startling injunction, has gathered together unto (εἰς) His name—that is to say, with Him—for their aim in worship. Whom maketh He Himself? The Church which adores Him knows. Deeply instructive, also, is it to observe that Christ's name for His Spirit is not the Spirit of emotion, however pure and tender, however rapturous and aspiring. In these days of hysterical impulse, when a lack of self-control is thought to be more a spiritual thing than gravity and sober-minded wisdom, and when great movements appear to have taken for their watchword the ironical phrase "I have become sounding brass," it is surely suggestive to observe that Christ loved best to call His Spirit the Spirit of truth, and that in the Old Testament He is the Spirit of knowledge and wisdom, and in the Epistles the Spirit of power, and love, and of a sound mind. Emotion, which in its place is good, is wisely sought not by cultivating a weak emotionalism, but by pondering on the mighty truths by which God would stir and warm our hearts. The Spirit is the Comforter, but much more than "comfort" is included in the great word Paraclete, and the comfort which it involves is not a gust of impulsive ardour; it is born of deep convictions and noble views of truth, and the Spirit of such comfort is essentially the Spirit of truth.

We reach the main subject of this evening when we ask further: What does this expression convey when viewed from an orthodox and frankly Christian standpoint? What special truth does it suggest to us commensurate with the remarkable paradox by which our Lord and Saviour bespoke our attention for it? Yes; it is a paradox. Who does not feel that with such a Teacher, the very Spirit of truth Himself, the natural assurance would be the reverse? "He shall guide you into all the truth, for He shall not speak from Himself." Can anything be more paradoxical than to say, "He shall guide you into all the truth, for He shall not speak from the Spirit of truth—not from Himself"? This, however, is what Jesus said; and there underlies it, I venture to think, a meaning full of hope for the Church and for humanity, and for that spiritual cause the reunion of all followers of Christ, which is the link that already unites us here.

Obviously the key to the whole passage—which, therefore, must fit this ward of the lock amongst the rest—is the fact that what is promised is not, after Pentecost any more than during the bodily presence of Jesus, omniscience. It is much the reverse. It is a progressive and steady advance in knowledge and discernment. "I still possess many things to tell you. He, when He shall come, shall lead you along the road into all truth—all that body of truth which it is Mine to tell." And how shall He thus lead the Church? By acting (it is a sublime and solemn expression), not as an independent teacher, albeit He might reveal all truth if it were well to do so—not thus, but as One who listens, who repeats only great words that are spoken by another in some region beyond mortal hearkening. He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever things He shall hear that shall He speak, and He shall announce to you the coming things. And whose voice He hears we know, since it is of what is Christ's that He shall take and reveal them unto us.

And why are these mysteries the things of Christ in a sense in which they do not belong to the spirit of abstract and ideal truth? Surely because Christ is the Governor of the world. All things which the Father hath are His. All power is committed to Him in heaven and in earth. And in the Apocalypse, when every being in heaven and earth had failed to open the book of the history of the future, the Lion of the tribe of Judah—the Lion who is also the Lamb—opened those awful seals which let loose one by one as He broke them, war and pestilence, and earthquake and the trumpets of the final judgment.

Thus we are led to the conclusion that Christ, who upon earth graduated His revelations according to the mental or moral capabilities of His disciples, still gives the time for all the revelations of His Spirit: the historical moment is awaited; the fact that something is profoundly true is not a sufficient reason why the Spirit should announce it; He speaks only when the providential hour has struck. When the voice of the King of history is heard to proclaim a truth in heaven, then it is ripe for utterance; and the Spirit of the truth makes it audible in the hearts of His people upon earth.

And yet is not this whole interpretation subverted by the words, "He shall show you the things to come"? It is certainly refuted if they mean that He is to show at a flash all the future of the world, for then there can be no attention to the fit moment for each several revelation. But this is precisely what the original words, which do not occur elsewhere, do not and cannot mean. What they promise is that He shall reveal the things that are actually coming, already drawing nigh and approaching births of time. The Church never need be taken by surprise by the march of Providence: it is hers to penetrate with a Divine insight the purpose and mystery of the world, the riddle of the painful earth; and while men's hearts fail them for fear and for peering into the things which are coming, the Spirit reveals them to His people, whose discernment ought therefore to be in advance of all the boasted wisdom of the world.

In the light of such a verse how grotesque a thing is all that monastic or Puritan asceticism which averts its gaze from life and its concerns, muttering to itself that the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hermetically sealed up lest the contamination of the meal should come at it. Not so. The people of Christ, as He wills to have them, know more of the meaning of events than other men, and, holding a clue to the labyrinth of affairs, they are profoundly interested because they are divinely taught.

This text does not stand alone, nor does the companion passage fail to throw a clear light upon its meaning. On the day when this Spirit actually came St. Peter hailed His advent as the fulfilment of the promise—"I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh: your sons and your daughters shall prophesy: your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." And he further said, "Repent, and ye shall receive this gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord your God shall call." But that is the promise of the Spirit poured out on all flesh, to give visions and dreams and prophetic insight. And it proves, if proof were needed, that our Lord's promise of guidance unto all the truth, and of revelation of the coming things, was not limited to the first age of the apostolic order, but announced a world-wide and universal endowment, limited only by the one condition that the Spirit of truth should not reveal truth merely as such, but as the proper truth for the occasion, ever speaking as He hears.

What has become of this great promise? What can the Church show to justify her claim to it? Or ought she to be covered with confusion if her enemies proclaim her a convicted boaster because no such endowment actually exists at all? To me it appears that sober-minded Christians have a sound and good reply to any such complaint, and that it lies on exactly the same level with her true answer to all taunts about the disappearance of miraculous power. The gift of miracles had a twofold object. In the relief of human misery they exhibited the benevolent mind of our reconciled God; and also they were an evidence which helped the new religion to take root. As evidence they belonged to the childhood of the faith, and when it became a man they were withdrawn. Miracles in the hands of a few princes or champions of the faith—in official hands—have disappeared.

But when the faith preached to the world the unity of God and the consistency and beauty of

all His plans, it supplied modern science with the germ whence all its wonders of beneficence have been evolved. And as it has always been the preacher and inspirer of all philanthropies, so to-day in a thousand hospitals and charitable agencies, and far more in the burning hearts of all its true disciples, it is the Good Samaritan of the race. Nor will any thoughtful men, of whatever views, deny that to freeze up the love of all baptised Christians in any land to-day would be a far greater loss to that country than if one or two distinguished persons had been moving up and down in it, working miracles like the apostles, and then suddenly withdrawn. But this is the same thing as to say that we have in the Church still as much physical and humanitarian benefit for the race as ever, only we have it in a form so natural, so easy, and, above all, so diffused, that its evidential and aggressive results, though they are not lost, are indirect, and veiled from hasty observation.

It is quite the same with prophecy. And when Joel, who was himself severed from common humanity by his gift, announced the future endowment of all flesh, of sons and daughters, young men and maidens, he proclaimed the coming abolition of his own order and special function. Its members were like the pools, which, when the tide is down, lie here and there among the rocks, but are merged at high water in the vast expanses of the universal flood. But it is not the loss of anything which has submerged them. The gift of the latter day should be universally diffused, and should so far less resemble a glare of lightning than the brooding, unrecognised electric forces which beset us behind and before continually, with results we little dream.

We have now together worked our way to the verge of the truth—modern, practical, and all-important—for the sake of which you are asked to consider this remarkable verse. That truth is that the whole Church is endowed with, and does actually exert, a steady force, parallel, and, to say the very least, equivalent to the rare and intermittent powers of the prophetic order in the pre-Christian ages. I do not say nor think that it is equally surprising. As I said of miracles, so do I say of this—it is no longer needed to dazzle men as an evidence, but to strengthen and edify them as a grace. But we must remember that even the older prophets foretold future events, not as fortune-tellers, but through their insight into the mind of God. And if human actions and tempers changed so greatly that the operations of His eternal principles (though not the principles themselves) were modified, then came strange results, as, on the one hand, the sparing of Nineveh, though Jonah was humiliated; or, in the other direction, the announcement, "I said indeed that I would establish thy throne for ever . . . . . but now be it far from Me."

Whatever else these passages imply, they surely teach us not to be disheartened because the claim now to be set up falls far short of omniscience so far that it is not infallibility. It is simply a straightforward claim to that which the literal words convey, without exaggeration and without flinching from their force—continual progress along the paths of practical truth, a divine perception of the meaning of events and of the tendencies of the history of our time, and so inspiring and elevating a faith in the loving government of the world as that our aspirations shall be a reality, and our visions and day-dreams shall mark a path along which the world is yet to travel.

This, I hold, is the God-given prerogative of the Church, however shamefully she may have failed of its enjoyment, however far from such visions are the eyes which earthly glories dazzle, and from such dreams the brows that are weighted with a triple crown. Nevertheless, when the mightiest practical issues have been propounded to the simple ones of Christ, their vision has been clear and true. In the primitive ages the questions which moved the Church were concerned with the profoundest mysteries of the revelation of God incarnated. The Church was unconsciously verifying the Divine credentials of her Guide, and I, for one, believe that the decisions then attained shall never be reversed, nor shall the Church retrace the steps along which she was then led. This I believe, not on the coercive authority of any Council whatever, but as persuaded that the Church in these great decisions was really leaning upon her Guide. At the Reformation, awaking from the drugged and feverish sleep in which manacles had been fastened on her wrists, she declared that no order and no class could pretend to monopolise the Spirit which was given to all flesh, and that where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. On many vital questions—the rights of the individual conscience, what is called the right of private judgment, but is really far less a right than a solemn responsibility and awful duty; above all, upon a free and childlike approach of man, the child, to God his Father, and on many another vital question, the Church of the Reformation spoke in clearer, bolder, and deeper tones than ever the Patristic Church had heard. And this is a perplexity and offence to some. But surely nothing short of this is implied in the promise that she should be led along the road into all truth.

And what are the great questions that concern the Church in our own time? What problems really press heaviest upon her heart? I submit to this assembly that they are not the problems of the Higher Criticism, so called, nor yet whether the material of which man was moulded was animate or inanimate dust. I, for one, have lived long enough to see with exultation the comparatively minor place which is now given to all such questions; and to have fared as in this region of our

sojourn, where you cross in a few hours the watershed of Europe, and feel the winds blowing over other regions, and see the rivers hurrying to mingle with other seas. Never was there a time when the Church in all its developments felt, either so keenly or at all in the same direction, its responsibility for social questions. That these are the questions of the time are felt by all. We hear—all men can hear it—

> Amid the strife
> A motion toiling in the gloom—the Spirit of the years to come,
> Yearning to mix himself with life.

A slow-developed strength awaits completion in a painful school. We all acknowledge it, but a new and startling thing is the extent to which the Church of God acknowledges its responsibility for all these movements of the public mind, and not only acknowledges, but boldly and eagerly claims it. Perhaps a first sign of what was coming was the great crusade against slavery. What was so remarkable was not the feeling of the guilt of traffic in human flesh and blood. Every reader of Longfellow can remember that even in the Middle Ages the dying Baron was often forced to manumit his thralls. But our fathers did not say that pious folk must not have slaves; they first said, "Pious folk must co-operate to make the nation emancipate its slaves"; and then they said, "Pious people must force the nation to suppress slavery all over the world." They were laughed at. They were dreamers and fanatics. But it is coming true—this vision which our young men saw, this dream which our old men dreamed.

Led forward along the road in all the truth, they declared that slavery, because it was demoralising, was in the nature of things accursed, and that to be accursed was to be doomed. Our nation was wise and heard them. In America they not only protested, but accepted martyrdom. But presently, by tokens that none might gainsay, by the red rain that falls fast on battle-fields, and the thunder that peals from cannon, it was proved that the Spirit had indeed shown them the coming things. And now it is beyond gainsaying that the Church of Christ is entangled with all the mighty questions of which the age is full—the claims of capital and labour, the rights of employers and employed, and of women, of children, of paupers, and even of the lower animals, and the best means of elevating the submerged and degraded beings—our poor relations every one of them, being our brothers and sisters still.

For better or worse these new ventures of the Church are now inevitable, and for my part I am heartily glad of it. Glad, not as doubting that she may easily make mistakes, nor yet the degrading speculation that it is good policy for religion to flatter the democracy, which is now king. Not so, but because it is among my deepest convictions that Jesus Christ died, not merely to save souls for eternity, but to save men, body, soul, and spirit, for this world as truly as for the world to come. I am also glad because it seems that only the intervention—the honest and whole-hearted intervention—of the Church of God can save, at this hour, the national life of England from the gravest peril.

Readers of Goethe and of Matthew Arnold know what is meant by the Time-Spirit. It is the tendency, the belief, the aspiration which is in the air, which all sympathetic and impressionable souls find pressing upon them like an atmosphere. It is the spirit which was sceptical in the age of Gibbon and Voltaire, and it is democratic, scientific and materialistic just at present. The thought of the Time-Spirit, we are openly told, is irresistible. To contradict it is infatuation and defeat. To be foremost in discerning its tendencies and formulating its mandates—to speak not of one's self, but as one hears of the Time-Spirit, that is the truest wisdom in practical affairs, and, above all, in political affairs. "Gentlemen," said Talleyrand to the Senate, "there is someone who has more *esprit* than Rousseau or Voltaire, than the Emperor Napoleon and the Academy. That some one is every one." Talleyrand was thinking of the Time-Spirit, and he was evidently prepared to support to the uttermost its august behests. And yet he also had *esprit* who said that heaven was intended for minorities and for those who were defeated upon earth. And one seems to have heard another and a less flattering name for this uncompromising loyalty to the Time-Spirit. It is surely our old friend Opportunism, "the cult of the jumping cat."

To-day, when democracies govern, and yet our most urgent questions are of the rights and obligations of these same democracies, who shall strengthen our various leaders, and we who follow, to be just and calm and fearless, and to declare that majorities have their duties as well as their rights? How shall we dare to set our convictions, if need be, against the rush of multitudes all going one way? What voice shall we match against the soul-subduing voice of the Time-Spirit? Only His who is the Spirit of the very truth itself, who speaks what He hears within the veil, and whose voice, uttered in the most secret places of the soul, is a genuine revelation of the future, telling His people of hopes for humanity grander and more elevating than all that newspapers are preaching, a hope that maketh not ashamed.

Do you not think that with such a Prompter the Church might well be the most resourceful and original of all the captains and leaders of the people? That if she is still too limp and passive, and we see little fulfilment nowadays of the old saying that all who will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution, it is because we are not braving aright the competition and jealousy of the Time-Spirit, the Spirit of the present day,

as ours is the Spirit of the future, the coming age?

Surely it will be otherwise, surely we shall speak aloud and be well heard when the voice of the Church is one, when she has solved, as now she is about to solve, that greatest of all social questions which concerns her own society, the reunion of Christendom, the reconciliation of the household of God. And although we know not yet a road to that mighty consummation, yet since the desire of it is moving in all Christian hearts, since our young men are seeing the vision, and our old men are dreaming the dream of a New Jerusalem coming from heaven to this world of ours, and builded as a city that is at unity with itself—oh, surely this vision is revealed by a ray from the Eternal Sun, the Spirit of the truth has shown us this great thing which is drawing nigh, and ours, bemocked and disbelieved—ours is a day-dream that comes true!

SALT WITH SAVOUR AND WITHOUT IT.

By W. H. JENKINS, T.C.D.

Sermon Preached at South Cliffe Church, North Cave, Yorkshire, on Sunday, January 20th, 1895.

"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt has lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of men."—Matt. v. 13.

SALT that has lost its savour or its taste is a peculiar expression and requires explanation. Salt, as it is known in our country, cannot possibly lose its saltness; before it could do that it would be all gone and nothing left. Its very essence is saltness. This arises because salt, as we use it, is a chemical compound, but it was not so in Eastern countries, neither is it so now. They there use it in its natural state, mixed up with a proportion of earth and vegetable matter, so that it is quite possible for the salt to lose all its saltness and a large proportion of it to remain that would be fit for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. This is, then, the literal interpretation of the passage which would be perfectly understood by those who heard our Lord. The salt is good only when it retains its saltness; when once it loses that it is then good for nothing but to be cast out. Now, this is how Christ applied it; He says to His disciples, "Ye are the salt of the earth." You must act the same part in the moral and spiritual world as salt does in the physical world. Salt, we know, seasons and preserves food from putrefaction. So our Lord tells His disciples, and, through them, tells Christians till the end of time, that they must season the world with their life and conversation, they must preserve it from putrefaction. This is what our Lord taught His disciples. To-day we would humbly tread in His footsteps and try to teach the same lesson, "Ye are the salt of the earth."

It would be well if every Christian had this sentence written in large letters always before his eyes; it would be well to have them written in our sitting-rooms and bedrooms. Christians are too apt to forget this most important truth, "Ye are the salt of the earth." Now, let us consider:

I. If we do our duty as Christians we are as salt of the earth.

II. If we neglect our duty we are as salt that has lost its savour.

I. If we do our duty as Christians we are the salt of the earth.

The Christian has a noble mission, no one more so. Many men and nations have taken upon themselves very noble missions, their mission has inspired their souls and has sustained them under every difficulty till they have attained their mark. The philanthropist, the statesman, the mighty man of war, each think they have a great mission in life. Now, the Christian has a very noble mission indeed. So great is his mission that he counts everything but dross in order that he may attain it. He is the salt of the earth. He strives to show what the world would have been had not sin entered it. It is true he fails to do this, but it is quite as true that he tries to show it. This is his mission. He is an example to his neighbours and relations, he is the salt, he seasons everything in the moral world. In a word, he strives to show what a good man is. We see this exemplified in the life of Moses. He had, indeed, a very hard task in leading that mixed multitude through the wilderness for forty long years. What murmurings he heard, how often he was threatened. Still, he himself had to bear it all, looking up to God for help. He had to show in his own person how to lead an upright life. He himself had to be the salt of that murmuring, wayward lot. The people murmured for want of water towards the end of their wandering life when they came to Kadesh. The stream followed them hitherto, now it failed. Moses was commanded to speak unto the rock in Kadesh before the people, and water should flow out. Instead of that he lost his temper, although he was one of the meekest of men, and smote the rock twice with his rod. The psalmist tells us that he spoke unadvisedly with his lips. For this transgression, because he did not believe in God and sanctify Him before the congregation of Israel, both Aaron and himself were debarred from entering the promised land. We look with sorrow on this lapse in a noble life, a blot in a great mission, and we think of our Lord's words, "To whom much is given, much is required." Great honour is laid on the Christians, they are kings and priests unto God, therefore God

expects them to show forth His praises and make known His loving kindness.

We must be salt in ourselves. Our daily life and connection, whether at home or abroad, in our own houses or in the market-places, in our dealings with the world, we must be as salt. Again, we must be as salt to others, helping them on to a life of virtue and holiness, rebuking the froward in love, strengthening the weak, seeking their highest good, this is how we should be as salt. More than this, if we are to fulfil this great and noble mission, we must go outside ourselves, outside our own houses, even outside our own proper class. A man staying at home dreaming of an ideal world will not fulfil his mission as salt in the world. He must go outside himself and leave here a grain and there a grain, just as the Levites were dispersed everywhere in Israel, a very wise provision. You remember all the tribes, except the tribe of Levi, had a portion of the land of Canaan, but the tribe of Levi, nevertheless, had a very rich inheritance, because the Lord said, "I will be their portion." The consequence was the Levites were dispersed among all the tribes. They seasoned and leavened the nation throughout, and this is how Christians should be. They should be found in the haunts of misery and crime, by the bed-side of the sick, in the house of mourning. They should weep with them that weep and rejoice with them that rejoice, and be the servants of all, as Christ told His disciples who disputed among themselves on their journey who should be the greatest. Now, we may ask ourselves, "Are we those who profess Christ, and does our daily life act as salt on those around and about us?"

II. If we do not our duty we are as salt that has lost its savour.

I think there can be no sight more lamentable than a professed Christian who does not act up to his profession; such an one, I am assured, does more harm to the cause of Christ than a thousand professed enemies, because here religion is wounded in the houses of His friends. It is concerning the whitewashed Christians of Laodicea that our Lord said: "I would thou wert either hot or cold"—either Mine enemy or My friend. Such are as salt that has lost its savour, they are good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. Now, when the Israelites left Egypt, within a very short time they came to the borders of Canaan. When they came there, God commanded Moses to choose out twelve men, a man for every tribe, princes of the people, to go and spy the land, and then bring back their report. These men started and came to the promised land, they went through part of it, cut down a bunch of grapes and returned with their evil report, saying the land was inhabited by giants, the sons of Anak, we were mere grasshoppers to them, we can never conquer people like these, we had better turn back again into Egypt. They despised that good land; only two, Caleb and Joshua, spoke truly of it. These said: "Let us go and possess the land: God has given it to us; be of good courage, neither be dismayed." Now, mark the effect of the evil counsel of the other ten. The people murmured fearfully against Moses and Aaron, and those who brought the evil report were all slain, and all the people from twenty years old and upwards were destined to die in the wilderness. This was the fate of the evil counsellors, because they were not true to God. They would not enter the promised land in God's time, therefore they would neither see nor enter it at all. The carcases of all of them should fall in the wilderness, except Caleb and Joshua. This was the effect of the evil counsel and not being true men. How often we see such effects as these in the spiritual world by those who, like the ten, bring an evil report on the good and better land, God's inheritance. God and His cause are blasphemed daily by means of hollow-hearted professors. Although there is no excuse whatever for any one, yet the carnal-minded man is apt and only too glad to lay his hands on anything that may ease his guilty conscience. If there be any one here who, by his or her conduct or conversation, brings discredit on God's holy work in this world, I would remind them of the case of those Israelites, and also of the Lord's word to their descendants: "If the salt has lost its savour, wherewith can it be seasoned? It is good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men." The Church of the living God here on earth, the Church militant, would be much better without these carnal-minded professors. But man has no means whatever of weeding out these; desirable as this would be it is, an utter impossibility. But what is impossible with men is possible with God. Among the church of the first-born there will not be found one of these half-hearted professors; they will all be cast out and trodden under foot. May we be all as salt of the earth, then we shall be found in the church of the first-born at last.

THE Rev. F. J. Jomini, vicar of St. Thomas's, Stepney, has accepted the living of Rainhill, rendered vacant by the death of the late Rev. John Barton. Mr. Jomini is also chaplain at one of the large business houses in the City. He has been for many years a member of the Council of the Church of England Young Men's Society.

CANON FREMANTLE'S appointment to the deanery of Ripon has been received more favourably in Evangelical quarters than might have been anticipated. The fact that he is not what is called a Sacerdotalist almost outweighs the objections to his exceeding Broad Church principles. The *Church Times* says:—"The wonder to us is that the Canon himself should care to accept office in a Church that is endowed, when he is doing his best to take their poor pittance from the Welsh clergy."

NOTICES.

Al communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper shoul be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon. at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1895.

EASTER EGGS.

THE origin of the Easter egg is lost in the mists of antiquity. One theory suggests that the egg is, in some way, emblematic of the Resurrection. But there are no grounds for supposing that eggs, any more than any other common objects, were ever regarded as specially appropriate emblems of the great Christian doctrines. If they had been, it is odd that we should not now be able to trace the fact. It is true that the common names of the Easter eggs—"pace," "pas," "pays," "pasce," "pask," "pasch," "passhe"—all seem to be varieties of the same word, and that word probably "Paschal." But this is one of the cases where the word has been suited to the action. Because these eggs were distributed about Easter-tide they were given a name connected with the Paschal Feast, supposing the suggested origin of the name to be the right one.

But the truth appears to be that the Easter egg has no connection with the Christian Festival at all. It is curious that it is most in vogue in those quarters to which Christianity penetrated late, or never succeeded in entirely driving out the myths and legends and quaint symbolism of the older faiths which it had destroyed. In the remoter parts of North Britain, in Russia, and even more in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, we find the ancient custom prevalent, just as we find many other relics of heathen ritual curiously mixed up with Christian ceremonies and symbols. And while we have little historical ground for believing the egg to play any conspicuous part in Christian imagery, we know that it was an ancient and general heathen emblem of the earth and its forces. We recognise its use among Romans, Greeks, Persians, and Egyptians, and the Parsees still keep up the custom of distributing eggs dyed red at their spring festival. Red, by the way, is the colour generally applied to the hard boiled eggs, which are still, in a few places, associated with Easter.

In this connection it is worth noticing that the name "Easter" itself is of heathen origin. It is the name of the old Saxon goddess of spring. The truth is that in this, as in many other cases, Christianity simply appropriated things it could not abolish. The Spring Feast of some kind was firmly established, but its significance was either dimly perceived or quite forgotten. It was a comparatively easy task to give it a new connection, and while keeping up the old name, and as much as possible of the old customs, to associate it with the new faith. To understand the simplicity of the proceeding, we have only to consider the popular attitude, at the present day, towards Easter Monday. Not one per cent. of the holiday-makers would interest himself in the theological aspect of the occasion or be a penny the worse if it were entirely altered. The chief thing is to get a holiday, and whether it be called Easter Monday or St. Lubbock's day, is quite beside the mark. Since Adam was a gardener the human race has enjoyed its holidays without minding how they came. The Easter egg must be regarded as one of those strange survivals which carry us back to the remotest antiquity. It is a pity that its days now seem to be numbered. First misunderstood, then abused, it is now likely to be abolished. The Easter egg has suffered from the same insensate passion for display which has killed the valentine. People left off sending round hard-boiled eggs, either plain coloured, or else with some device cunningly worked upon the shell with the help of a little tallow. They began, instead, to make elaborate presents. Egg-shaped receptacles were made to contain delicate sweetmeats, bonbons, *bijouterie*, and finally gold coins and valuable jewels, to say nothing of such fanciful devices as pug puppies and Shetland ponies. A simple sentiment was thus degraded into a means of vulgar display, with the inevitable sequel, that it went out of fashion altogether. The confectioners' shops still keep up a little show of fancy contrivances, and here and there we still come across a few red egg-shells, the last relic of the times when eggs went up in price about Good Friday, and the children rolled their Easter eggs down hill-sides, and speculated much on the future of those whose eggs got broken, while they made an indigestible lunch on the contents. But to all intents and purposes the Easter egg has joined the valentine, and all the other faded remnants of old traditions in the limbo of forgotten things. No one remembers its origin and no one has noted its decay.

NO USE.

THE result of an interesting experiment tried by the Camberwell Board of Guardians confirms a sad fact in pauper history. The Guardians, twelve months ago, sent 110 able-bodied paupers to the Salvation Army Colony at Hadleigh to see what could be done towards making them respectable members of society. Five shillings per head per week was paid by the Guardians, lodging, clothing, and wholesome food provided, and at the end of each week a small amount of pocket-money, to be spent as the men liked, only beer being barred.

The result was that at the end of the year only thirty-four men remained upon the farm — some had left within a week of their arrival. Of the seventy-six who departed, all, with the exception of fifteen, returned to Camberwell Workhouse. Of the fifteen who did not return, it has been ascertained that only three obtained work, and it may, therefore, be taken for granted that the remaining twelve are in other workhouses.

Leaving out of count the thirty-four who are still under observation, but who have achieved no satisfactory result so far, we may say that out of seventy-six able-bodied paupers, and those not, to all appearance, the worst kind of paupers, for men manifestly unfit for the experiment would not have been submitted to it, only three have shown the smallest prospect of reinstatement. The seventy-three are confirmed loafers, ne'er-do-weels, who prefer hanging about the streets of a big town to a career of industry and a settled livelihood. It will be noticed that no less than sixty-three are back in Camberwell. We hear much talk about the people going back to the land, but the great mass of cadgers and unskilled labourers have no desire to do any such thing. It is a far cry from a remote corner of Essex to Camberwell. And yet considerably more than half of these fellows found their way back to their old haunts within a few months of leaving them, and the rest are probably on their way. Neither the Camberwell Guardians nor the farm colony superintendent have any faith in their future. The report is that many of them are discontented and drunkards, and that only a very small percentage of them have any knowledge of any trade. And when a man reaches maturity without being able to put his hand to any honest occupation we may form a fairly accurate notion of how much he is worth.

Much sentiment has lately been spent upon the pauper. Immense enthusiasm has been aroused over such abortive schemes as that of the Salvation Army. Indeed, some of us hoped for great results. Facts, however, are all pointing to the conclusion that the submerged tenth mean to stay under water. It is composed of individuals who have been left behind in the march of progress, who remain upon a lower moral level, and whose drift is away from any kind of restraint or control. This class has its representatives all over the world. The Australian black, the extinct Bosjesman, the unteachable varieties of Red Indian, the loafer of Camberwell, all share one common nature. They will not do any work, except by rare fits and starts; they will not put up with any restraint, or recognise any moral code, except upon compulsion. Their wants are few and easily supplied. They are not particular about the roof which covers them, nor about the beds on which they lie. They have no ideas about cleanliness or tidiness, beyond the obvious fact that they object to both. Their notion of home has not got beyond a vague, but powerful attachment to localities. It is positively no use trying to alter them, or turn them into respectable, law-abiding, thrifty citizens.

On the whole, perhaps, it is better to keep things as they are for this class of strange survivals. The casual ward, the street shelter, and the workhouse provide them, in extremities, with all they need, plus a bath and one or two other torments of the civilisation which they detest, but do not actively make war upon. They never need actually starve or freeze, or die of disease untended, though they occasionally do, out of pure cussedness. The life they lead is of their choice, not of their necessity; they are happier as they are.

But the reflection suggests itself that, after all, it is rather hard that so little distinction is made between paupers of this class, and those who from temporary need are driven upon the mercies of the Union. The latter class will always be few in number, and it should not be impossible to provide some means of succouring them without their having to endure the association, and share the shame of the chronic loafer and vagabond. This is the real *crux* of poor relief. There is no reproach in unavoidable poverty, and one should not be artificially incurred. Nor should means of relief without degradation be made impossible to men and women who have done their best in their time, and perhaps paid their share towards helping others. It is in this direction that the sympathies of the charitable and thoughtful public should work, instead of being wasted upon the ragged regiment of wandering Willies who neither deserve nor desire them.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE weather was favourable for a large attendance at the Holy Week services, and many London churches have been crowded. In others, though the attendance has been sparse, the clergy have generally done their best to provide services and special sermons. It has now become a rare thing for a church in the metropolis not to be opened at least once a day during this season. There appears to be a growing tendency to have a celebration of Holy Communion on the evening of Maundy Thursday,

but the practice does not extend far beyond the most pronounced of the Evangelical clergy. The anniversary of the institution of the Eucharist is honoured in some of the Ritualistic churches by a choral celebration at mid-day.

The Good Friday services, like those of the earlier days in the week, had the advantage of fine weather. The use of the unauthorised services of "Tenebræ" and "The Reproaches" appears to be extending, and so, undoubtedly, is the practice of representing the events of the day by magic-lantern pictures in parochial mission rooms, and sometimes even in churches. In many places an oratorio—"The Crucifixion" by preference—has superseded the evening service prescribed in the Prayer-book This innovation is confined to no party in the Church.

One is inclined to fancy that the Three Hours Service is not quite so general as it had become a few years ago. It has been dropped in one of the Kensington churches, that of St. Barnabas, where it has been the rule for many years. At the parish church of Kensington, where, as usual, the service was conducted by the vicar, there was a very large attendance. The Three Hours Service was held for the first time on Good Friday in Newcastle Cathedral. At Bristol Cathedral, where it was introduced by the present Dean, Dr. Pigou preached on "The Seven Deadly Sins in the Light of the Cross."

The Easter Day preachers at St. Paul's Cathedral were the Dean in the morning, Canon Newbolt in the afternoon, and the Rev. Berdmore Compton in the evening. At Westminster Abbey, the Dean being still absent on account of ill health, the morning sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Bright, Master of University College, Oxford. Canon Duckworth preached in the afternoon.

The announcement that the Bishop of London has selected Canon Browne as Dr. Billing's successor in the episcopal supervision of East London has excited some surprise, for the Bishop-Designate has had hardly any parochial experience, and his studies and interests have been as far removed as possible from the details of such work as an East London Bishop must have to do. But Canon Browne is as little likely to accept an appointment for which he is not conscious of a vocation as the Bishop is to choose an unsuitable person, and we may well believe, therefore, that the Bishop of Stepney (for so the new Suffragan is to be called) will prove himself in no way inferior to his predecessors; he cannot hope to do better.

Canon Browne is to be consecrated at St Paul's on Sunday, April 21st. The service will begin at 10 30 with a sermon by the Rev. A. F. Winnington Ingram, Head of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green. The Rev. J R. Harmer will be consecrated at the same time as Bishop of Adelaide.

The appointment of a new Speaker of the House of Commons vacates the office of chaplain. Archdeacon Farrar, who was appointed by Mr. Peel in 1890, may be continued in office by Mr. Gully, or he may not. He is not, as is often supposed, chaplain to the House, but to the Speaker.

The Archbishop of York has given some offence to moderate Churchmen in his diocese by the way in which he has treated the complaints brought before him of the illegal practices indulged in by the clergy of Christ Church, Doncaster. The complainants have been practically snubbed, though they are formally thanked for their action, and though the Archbishop has ordered the discontinuance of some proceedings objected to, notably the reservation of the Holy Sacrament. Dr. Maclagan apparently finds nothing contrary to the teaching of the Church of England in the setting up of confession boxes in a parish church and the provision of holy water for the use of the worshippers.

The Bishop of Liverpool goes to the other extreme. Considering that the use of lights on the Communion Table is now unquestionably legal, it seems a stretch of authority to prohibit them, as Dr. Ryle has done, upon any occasion upon which he visits a church in his official character. The prohibition gave rise to a scene the other day. Bishop Royston, the Assistant-Bishop for the diocese, visited St. Margaret's, Anfield, to conduct a confirmation, when candles were lighted on the Communion Table. Bishop Royston thereupon informed Mr. Wakeford, the vicar, that the lights must be extinguished before the service could be proceeded with, and on Mr. Wakeford refusing compliance, he was informed that if the instructions were not carried out there would be no confirmation that day. Eventually the vicar gave way, and the lights were extinguished by the verger in the presence of the congregation.

THE WISE AND THE FOOLISH VIEW OF LIFE.

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., stated:—

Certainly the cleverest men are not the saddest, unless they trust to their own fancies, count themselves wise above what is written, and thus weaken their judgments. Then they are often silly in speech and sad at heart. They will whine and cry, "Why does genius ever wear a crown of thorns, self-woven, and inherent in the very condition of his being?" The reply is, "They are willing to have the trail and slime of the serpent over them." Our seeing to the proportionate development of the physical, mental, moral nature produces a man of the most perfect temporal and future condition. The trials, labours, self-denial undergone in attaining this height give the healthiest, happiest, most vigorous and best state. To effect this we need a justness of sense, which is more valuable than subtlety of brain, and having it we shall best respond to the interrogations as to the why and wherefore of existence, by giving the best we have and doing the best we know in our place, and for Him who gave it.

There are two bad sorts of men: those who turn from faith, accounting themselves very wise; and those incapable of belief, who have made themselves very stupid. The wise will do well to think that the apparent uniformity of nature is really more evidential of the miraculous and the supernatural than are the leaps and gaps. It shows the grand subordination of the universe to rule—a prevalence of Eternal Power. Thereby they will value that spirit, that exuberance of joyful and high use of faculties, which in our best state gives us a glimpse, a touch, a taste of the sublime. Sometimes all things seem possible. The stupid may abate their stupidity by trying to learn that all the elements came out of that which was not in itself elemental; that the organic came out of the inorganic; and life from that which was not already alive in the earth, but was made to live; and that death takes the weak and the painful by transmutation

into other state and place, for better uses or for worse as they are suitable. If the wise use wisdom in right enjoyment and use of the beautiful present, and live in it as a tabernacle; if the stupid will take the first step in wisdom by learning that things do not pass into nothingness, wise and stupid will answer every interrogation as to the why and wherefore of existence by the fact that we and all things are passing on to scenes very beautiful and very happy—a state of everlastingness.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." April, 1895. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

THE *Expository Times* is full of life. You get in the "Notes on Recent Exposition" very well written summaries of the latest conjectures, German or English, as to readings, MSS., etc.. etc. You get reviews and articles from the standpoint of Higher Criticism; you also get vigorous attacks thereon by Dr. Elder Cumming and others. It is very useful, very useful indeed, but it does not tend to a quiet mind.

In the controversy *in re* Christ's promise to St. Peter (St. Matt. xvi.), we certainly feel the force of the argument by Professor Bruce, Professor Beyschlag, and Dr. Denney, that "the magnificent ideal with which the Church is spoken of . . . . authenticate the words as genuinely Christ's." And we feel that the argument that St. Paul cannot have known of the prerogative assigned to St. Peter, or he would never have spoken of him as seeming to be a pillar, is just the kind of argument that should be used with the utmost caution. We concede, however, that it is very strange that the oldest patristic evidence for the words are from Tertullian and Origen.

"The Parables of Zechariah" are continued by Dr. Stalker; the Rev. J. Taylor's paper on Wellhausen's latest work is well worth reading, and the hopeful tone of the writer is most reassuring.

"THE EXPOSITOR." March and April, 1895. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

THE March number opens with a most interesting paper by Mr. A. Cowley, of Trinity College, Oxford, on "The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah." In most respects it is a paper more intended for specialists than ordinary students, but the attention of the latter will be aroused by the "undesigned coincidences" between the Samaritan Hymn recently found at Gotha and Christ's conversation with the woman, recorded in St. John iv.

The same number contains a short paper by Professor Marcus Dods, written to show that the idea that St. Paul thought the gods of the Greeks were demons, is entirely mistaken. But that the Jews of the period held that opinion there can be very little doubt. After the time of the Exile, as Professor Schultz says ("Old Testament Theology," II., 275), "The gods of the heathen would appear in a form that closely approximates to the notion of malevolent powers hostile to the salvation and sovereignty of God:" and in the note he says that in such passages as Deut. xxxii. 17 and Psalm cvi. 37, the heathen gods and demons seem to merge into one another. Undoubtedly δαιμόνια is a very indefinite word, and may have a good, or at least a neutral meaning; but it seems difficult to see any other view than that on the surface in 1 Cor. x. 20, and following, viz., that St. Paul really saw a worship of demons in idolatry.

In the April number, Dr. Driver handles Mr. Valpy French's article in "Lex Mosaica" very severely. We have not as yet sufficiently read "Lex Mosaica," so we will defer any remarks, except this—that Dr. Driver's manner might be more courteous with advantage. Higher Criticism may be right, but its advocates need to be more than ordinarily cautious and conciliatory, and Dr. Driver lacks both caution and conciliatoriness.

The Rev. Henry Burton, on "The Wise Men," is really eloquent. He brings the strange episode in St. Matt. ii. very vividly before us, making it real and full of instruction.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

SIR,—That a "Professor of Interpretation of Holy Scripture," a Canon of the Church of England, should preach and publish such a sermon as that contained in your issue of January 6, 1894, and entitled "Some of the Beatitudes," is a sign of the times, insinuating as it does the uncertainty and untrustworthiness of the Word of God, and undermining also the absolute authority of the Son of God, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

According to this modern doctor, we cannot dispense with men like "the illustrious, though faulty, Mazzini," seeing that they are "*prophets of not less faith, but more insight*," than the Hebrew prophets. But the Apostle Peter says distinctly that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. i. 21). Are we to follow St. Peter or Professor Cheyne?

Again, he says that "the expectations of the Old Testament writers, and of those New Testament writers who most nearly resemble them, are *too childlike for us to take over quite as they stand*." Here, then, is a sort of censorship of Holy Scripture to which the Professor lays claim. He cannot take Scripture as it stands, and in this sermon he is certainly as good as his word. According to him, the forms in which the Fourth Beatitude appears in the New Testament are interpretations of our Lord's words rather than the actual words themselves. Christ said, "Blessed are the hungry," and this was changed by St. Matthew and St. Luke according to their own views. As for the hunger-woe of Luke vi. 25, it was probably an appendix made by St. Luke from Isaiah lxv. 12-16. It was not the Saviour's saying, and it does not even represent his mind, according to this modern Professor. But such adulteration of the plain teaching of Christ would, if proved, convict the Evangelist of gross error, if not of wilful deception. Shall we believe St. Luke or Professor Cheyne?

But this apostle of the negative criticism is not content with all this. He makes passing mention of Daniel, and must needs fall upon him, casting poor Daniel, not indeed into a den of lions, but into a limbo of lies. Daniel iv. 27 was, we are told, "*put into the mouth of Daniel*," and the book itself was written pro-

bably in the year 164 B.C. It could not, therefore, have been written by Daniel at all, but by an apocryphal writer of some centuries later. But here the reputation of the Infallible Teacher is involved, for our Lord calls the historical Daniel a prophet, and refers to his prophecy concerning things to come (Matt. xxiv. 15). Are we, then, to call Christ or Professor Cheyne our master?

JAMES SILVESTER.

P.S.—The italics are my own.

Hereford, April 9, 1895.

A CRITICISM.

SIR,—Kindly allow me to add two or three supplementary observations to my former letter. We are told in the notice of the book referred to that "the author attributes much" of the influence that developed our Lord's "strange powers and subversive teaching" "to a certain summary of Hillel's teaching (about 30 B.C.) called 'The Two Ways.'" The author thus reproduces the late M. Renan, who, in his false and frivolous book, says that "Hillel *fut le maître de Jésus.*" Dr. Farrar has well said: "The originality of Jesus even to those who regard Him as a mere human teacher consists in this—that His words have touched the hearts of all men in all ages, and have regenerated the moral life of the world. . . . We see how the notion of Hillel's being in any way a master of Christ crumbles into dust. . . . Hillel's teaching was legal, causistic, and narrow, while that of Jesus was religious, moral, and human. . . . The very name of Hillel is unknown except to scholars. The words of Jesus wrought the mightiest revolution that has ever been witnessed in the world. Had humanity nothing better to live on than the words of Hillel it would be dwarfed and starved indeed. The shortest and slightest of our Saviour's Parables is worth all that he ever said" (Farrar's "Life of Christ," pp. 738, and note 2, 740, 741).

We are also told that "those good people who occupy themselves with the conversion of the Jews little understand the attitude of mind in a conscientious Jew . . . any more than Shakespeare understood the Chosen People when he made *Jessica*, in 'The Merchant of Venice,' false to her religion and false to her filial duty—two impieties which mean far more amongst the Jews than amongst Christians."

The occurrence of the words "Conscientious Jew" in connection with "The Merchant of Venice" is, at first sight, somewhat comical, as the figure of Shylock, "the Jew, whom Shakespeare drew," rises before the mind's eye—Shylock claiming

> "A pound of flesh to be by him cut off
> Nearest the merchant's heart,"

and refusing to permit the surgeon to be called in because—

> "I cannot find it; 'tis not in the bond."

It is not necessary to defend Shakespeare, since, as Dr. Johnson says, he "may claim the privilege of established fame and prescriptive veneration. . . . and his works, as they have devolved from one generation to another, have received new honours at every transmission"—though, indeed, King George III. is reported to have said "Shakespeare wrote sad stuff, but we mustn't say so." If excuse were needed, it might perhaps be found in fact the that, when Shakespeare wrote, the Jews had been banished from England for something like 300 years. They had certainly for fifteen centuries ceased to be the "*Chosen* People," and had become "the proverb and the by-word among all nations," as their own Scriptures had foretold. (Deut. xxviii. 37; Matt. xxiii. 34-39)

Shakespeare, however, seems to portray *Jessica* naturally enough when he makes her say:

> "Alack, what heinous sin it is in me
> To be ashamed to be my father's child;
> But though I am a daughter to his blood
> I am not to his manners. O Lorenzo,
> If you keep promise, I shall end this strife,
> Become a Christian and thy loving wife."
> —"Merchant of Venice," Act II., scene 3.

How can "the impiety" of "being false to one's filial duty mean far more amongst the Jews than amongst the Christians"? Is not Christianity the fulfilment of Judaism? (Matt. v. 17.) Is not a Christian, in some sense, as Lord Beaconsfield said, "a developed Jew"? Have not Christians the same Ten Commandments as the Jews? (Eph. vi. 1, 2.) Is the Christian conscience less sensitive than the Jewish? (See Matt. v. 21, 22, 28, 29, 33, 34, 43, 44.) Does not Christianity enforce and diffuse with its life-giving spirit all that Judaism held cramped within its deadening letter? (2 Cor. iii. 6.)

Further, we are told, and truly, that there are few teachers and clergy to-day—I would fain hope there are none—who would dare to say to a humble creature crying after them, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs" (Matt. xv. 26). But do we not owe this blessed deliverance from these hard, cruel, old-world notions to Christ, Who "has made of both one," and has taught us that "One is our Father, Who is in heaven, and that all we are brethren" (Matt. xxiii. 8, 9; Eph. ii. 14), and to Christianity which declares that "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all" (Col. iii. 11). The woman was, as St. Mark tells us, a Greek (Ἑλληνίς), that is, a Gentile. And the benighted Gentiles were so sunk in degraded idolatry that even "conscientious Jews" were apt to look on them as no better than dogs. Bengel has the following quotation:—"Midrasch Tillim: *Nationes mundi assimilantur canibus*," and Wetstein "*Megilla Exod.* xii. 16, *convocatio sancta est vobis: vobis non canibus; vobis, non extraneis.*" In more modern times the tables have been turned, and too often the Jew has had to say to those who have showed nothing of Christ's spirit—

> "You call me—misbeliever, cut-throat dog,
> And spit upon my Jewish gaberdine."

As Bishop Wordsworth says, as to the use of the word κυναρίοις: "Not that our Lord regarded the Gentiles as 'dogs,' but because they were so called by the Jews, whose language he adopts." As Dr. Farrar says: "He may have desired to test yet further the woman's faith."

I will conclude with some words of the late Archbishop Trench. This heathen woman, from the very word which seemed to make most against her, draws, with the ready wit of faith, an argument in her own behalf. She entangles the Lord, Himself most willing thus to be so entangled, in His own speech. . . . . Upon these words Luther, who has dwelt on all the circumstances of this little history with a peculiar love, and is never weary of extolling the mighty faith of this woman, exclaims, "Was not that a masterstroke? She snares Christ in His own words." And

oftentimes he sets this Canaanitish woman before troubled and fainting hearts, that they may learn from her how to wring a Yea from God's Nay. Or rather, how to hear the deep hidden Yea which many times lurks under His seeming Nay. "Like her, thou must give God right in all He says against thee, and yet must not stand off from praying, till thou overcomest as she overcame, till thou hast turned the very charges made against thee into arguments and proofs of thy need, till thou too hast taken Christ in His own words."

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 6th, 1895.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baugh, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Kempston, Bedford; Rector of Wetherden, Suffolk.

Bowerman, Rev. Alfred George, Curate of St. George's' Douglas; Chaplain of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Cronk-y-Voddy, German, Isle of Man.

Boyden, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Pendeen, Penzance; Vicar of Thorpe Hamlet, Norwich.

Clarke, Rev. Samuel Edmond, M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Burnley; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bury.

Cocks, Rev. Edward George, Assistant-Chaplain of St. Bartholomew's, Rosario; Incumbent of Lomas, Buenos Ayres.

Coleman, Rev. George Worsley, M.A., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Tonge Moor; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lancashire.

Coombes, Rev. H. E. H., Curate of Christ Church, Eastbourne; Vicar of Houghton, Cumberland.

Copeland, Rev. George Dale, B.D., Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Pudsey; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.

Dalby, Rev. William Bramley Sayle, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Oxford; Rector of Combs, Stowmarket,

Dale, Rev. Arthur, B.A., Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Longsight; Rector of St. James-the-Less, Manchester.

Davey, Rev. William Harrison, M.A., Vice-Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Llandaff.

Dyson, Rev. Frank, M.A., Principal of Liverpool College; Head Master of Eastbourne College.

Emmott, Rev. Theodore, M.A., Curate of Todmorden; Rector of Much Birch, Hereford..

Evans, Rev. William; Vicar of St. Leonard's, Bucks.

Ffolkes, Rev. F. A. S., Rector of Scoulton; Diocesan Inspector for the Deanery of Breccles.

Fremantle, Rev. the Hon. William Henry, M.A., Canon of Canterbury; Dean of Ripon.

Haggard, Rev. Christopher, M.A.; Vicar of Holy Trinity, West-end, Chobham.

Hall, Rev. Stuart, Vicar of West Bickleigh; Vicar of Horrabridge, Devon.

Hart-Davies, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Southam; Chaplain to Southam Union Workhouse.

Hill, Rev. John Seymour Granville, Vicar of Newport, Barnstaple; Vicar of St. George's, Tiverton.

Houghton, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of St. John's Park, Sheffield; Vicar of St. Mark's, Brighton.

Jomini, Rev. Frederick John, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Arbour-square, Stepney, London; Vicar of Rainhill, Prescot.

Kerr-Smith, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Middleham; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.

Kershaw, Rev. John Albert, M.A.; Rector of Aythorpe Roding.

Kinred, Rev. Hugh, Perpetual Curate of Cronk-y-Voddy; Curate-in-Charge of Patrick, Isle of Man.

Knowles, Rev. C. Q., Rector of Melton Constable; Diocesan Inspector for the Deanery of Holt.

Leece, Rev. Charles Henry, Curate of Kirk Braddan; Chaplain of Christ Church, Laxey-in-Lonan, Isle of Man.

Lias, Rev. John James, M.A., Rector of East Bergholt, Suffolk; Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral.

Litt, Rev. J. L., Curate of St. Mary's, Aston Brook, Birmingham; to the Charge of St. Stephen's, Stockport.

Longrigg, Rev, Joseph William, M.A., R.N., Chaplain to the *Thunderer*; Chaplain to the *Sans Pareil*.

Lyttelton, Rev. the Hon. Arthur T., M.A., Vicar of Eccles; Rural Dean of Eccles.

Maclean. Rev. Arthur James, M.A.; Rector of Micheldean, Gloucester.

Marsdin. Rev. A. C., Curate of Heckmondwike; Sole Charge of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Bexley, Kent.

Nash, Rev. Francis Peel, M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Swinton, Manchester; Vicar of St. John's, Blackburn,

Naters, Rev. Charles Cuthbert, M.A.; Rector of St. James's, Colchester.

O'Callaghan, Rev. James, Curate of Aghade and Ardoyne; Rector of Rathvilly, Diocese of Leighlin.

Parker, Rev. John, M.A, Missions to Seamen Chaplain at Hull; Vicar of Barrow-on-Humber.

Pope, Rev. Edwin, M.A., Vicar of Paddock Wood, Kent; Rector of Latchingdon, Essex.

Pratt, Rev. W. T., Rector of Bedfield; Diocesan Inspector for the Deanery of Flegg (Yarmouth).

Raikes, Rev. Thomas Digby, M.A., Assistant-Master at St. Peter's College, Radley; Vicar of Marcham-with-Garford, Berks.

Rogers, Rev. Henry Izod, M.A., Curate; Rector of Cottered-with-Broadfield, Herts.

Rogers, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Vicar of Thorpe Hamlet, Norwich; Vicar of Pendeen, Penzance.

Rosser, Rev. James. Rector of Wetherden, Suffolk; Vicar of Kempston, Bedford.

Rycroft, Rev. Edmund Hugh, M.A.; Rector of Highclere, Newbury.

Savage, Rev. Henry Edwin, M.A., Vicar of South Shields; Honorary Canon of Durham Cathedral.

Scott, Rev. Percy Richard, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Tiverton, and Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral; Rector of St. Peter's, Tiverton.

Smethurst, Rev. James, B.A., Rector of Shipham; Perpetual Curate of Horrington, Somersetshire.

Smith, Rev. Barnard G., M.A., Rector of Thorpe; Diocesan Inspector for the Deanery of East Brooke.

Smith, Rev. F. R., M.A., Vicar of Flixton; Diocesan Inspector for the Deaneries of Wangford and South Elmham.

Smith, Rev. George Crowther, Chaplain of the South Metropolitan District Schools; Perpetual Curate of Little Dunmow, Essex.

Squires, Rev. Robert Alfred, M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Tunbridge Wells; Vicar of St. Peter's, St. Albans.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beaufort, Rev. William Augustus, at Kingsland, Shrewsbury, on the 13th inst., aged 83.

Bullocke, Rev. Henry, late Vicar of Ewias Harold, at Honiton, on the 12th inst., aged 54.

Chichester, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Drewsteignton, Exeter, on the 11th inst., aged 56.

Joynes, Rev. Richard, B.D., Honorary Canon of St. Albans, and formerly Rector of Great Holland, at Tunbridge Wells, on the 12th inst., aged 76.

Kirkpatrick, Rev. William, on his way home from Russia, on the 5th inst., aged 33.

Moorsom, Rev. Joseph Robertson, for forty-seven years Rector of Southoe and Vicar of Hall Weston, at Southoe Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 75.

Rice, Rev. Morgan John, M.A., of Grange Erin, Douglas, Cork, at the Grand Hotel de la Mediterranée, Pegli, Genoa, Italy, on the 6th inst., aged 47.

Richards, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Rector, at Shelley Rectory, Ongar, on the 2nd inst.

Roe, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone, at Mentone, on the 9th inst., aged 51.

Rushton, Rev. James, M.A., for forty-three years Rector of the Parish of Longstowe, Cambridge, at the Rectory, on the 4th inst., aged 76.

Sharp, Rev. Theophilus, M.A., formerly Rector of St. Andrew's, Worcester, at Harvington Rectory, on the 12th inst, aged 78.

Sharpe, Rev. Robert Napier, at St. Mary's Vicarage, Rochdale, on the 6th inst., aged 70.

Simpson, Rev. William Bridgeman, M.A. Cantab, for fifty-seven years Rector of Babworth, at Babworth Rectory, Retford, on the 1st inst., aged 81.

Stogdon, Rev. A. H., at 13, Dix's-field, Exeter, on the 8th inst., aged 80.

Wadley, Rev. Thomas Procter, M.A., Rector, at Naunton Beauchamp, on the 4thi nst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MINISTERS OF OUR LORD THE KING.

By the Very Rev. Dean of Ely, C. W. Stubbs, D.D.

Preached on behalf of the Christian Social Union at Holy Trinity Church, Sloane Square, Sunday, December 23rd, 1894.

"The rough places shall be made plain."—Isaiah xl. 4.

THERE is a traditional saying of Christ, apocryphal in origin, but occurring in various forms in the writings of the early Greek Fathers, which runs to this effect: "Unless ye shall cause that which is on the right hand to be on the left, and that which is on the left hand to be on the right, and that which is above to be below, and that which is before to be behind, ye have no knowledge of the Kingdom of God." Now, whatever authority there may be for this apocryphal saying of Christ, there can be no doubt that it represents the spirit at least of that proclamation of Christ's Kingdom by John the Baptist which we are practically considering in this course of sermons. Jesus Christ Himself was not a Revolutionist, yet the kingdom which He established was meant to revolutionise the world. Christ did come to remodel society, He did come to turn the world upside down; to place that which was on the left hand on the right, and that which was on the right hand on the left, and that which was above, below, and that which was before, behind; and the Christian Church in the idea of its Founder had for its object the reorganisation and the reconstitution of society no less than the salvation of the individual. And although in the history of Christendom it is, alas! only too easy to find many chapters which record only the Church's failure to sustain the character of a saviour of society, yet when we remember that all history is but a record of imperfectly realised ideals, it is only fair, surely, to ascribe the social failures of the Church to a falling short of the original ideal rather than to any want of completeness in the ideal itself. In our own immediate days, thank God, the Church of this country, at any rate, is reaching out once more to this completer social ideal—she is learning to go behind the pinched and narrow faith of the Latin authority to the richer, more large-hearted, more inspiring doctrines which are the characteristics of the early Greek Christian Fathers. Through the closer recognition of the doctrine of the *preincarnate* Word and the Incarnate Christ, and of the consequent doctrine of His supremacy over all realms of thought and action, the Church seems to be gaining a new feeling about Christ in our age, a new conception of Him almost as the inspirer and illuminator of man in his intellectual and social being, the life of humanity, the quickening impulse of all that is best in what we call modern civilisation, the nourisher of new graces in the ever-widening circles of the family, the society, and the State, the social leader and emancipator, the head over all things of the Church, the fulness of Him which filleth all in all.

Now, it is this aspect of Christ's personality which the Christian Social Union by its constitution and its aim is always bound to emphasize. It is this doctrine of Christ's supremacy, and all the consequences which flow from it as a living influence, which I ask you to keep in mind while I ask you to consider with me one at least of those rough places in our modern life which needs, I think, to be made plain. What are some of those rough places? Problems of property, the accidental difficulties of unrestricted competition, the evils consequent upon the transition of society from a basis which is mainly individualistic to a basis which is mainly socialistic, the problem of the living wage and the eight hours day, the problem of the decasualisation of labour and the relief of those out of work, the problem of the poor-law reform, of old-age pensions, of the protection of women workers, of the murderous waste of child life, the problem of the due regulation of the liquor traffic and of harlotry, the problem of putting down betting and iniquitous speculation, commercial or otherwise; the problem, in a word, of civic ignorance and civic crime. Yet all these are rough places in our cities and life which have to be made plain, problems which you and I are bound in the name of the Imperial Christ, who was once a carpenter's son, to try and solve.

Of course I am not proposing to-night to ask you to consider all these problems. I want you to think for a moment or two, and to take the thought into further meditation at home, about a subject, more commonplace, perhaps, less sensational anyhow, but not less important, I fancy. I mean the problem of efficient administration, whether municipal or national, in a democratic state of society, how to combine the trained efficiency of the administrator with the generous enthusiasm, the social passion, if you will, of the democrat and the Socialist. This appears to me to be one of the roughest places ahead in the path of democratic control upon which England completely entered lately, one of the most difficult problems of the immediate future for English citizenship to solve; and remember that it is mainly a religious problem, for its solution depends chiefly, as it seems

to me, on ethical considerations of national character, for it is a law of the stability of social reforms that they must always be expressive of national character; they come into existence bearing its impress, they live only so long as it supplies them with vitality. A revolution by force, it is true, can re-make a government, but it is only a revolution in moral character that can re-make a people. Of the genius of Englishmen for administration and government under the old condition of things we can none of us have any doubt, I suppose. We have only to think of the great Indian Civil Service and the noble way in which from time to time our countrymen, often hardly out of their boyhood, rose to the responsibilities of Government over vast districts of that great empire. We have only to read such a book as that of Mr. Alfred Milner's on England in Egypt to recognise once more with national pride how, under the influence simply of English common-sense and English justice, the whole administration of Egypt during the last few years in all departments, army, finance, agriculture, education, law and justice, has been quickened into a life and a promise for the future, the story of which reads like a fairy tale. Yes, but there are those who fear that in England herself the imperial qualities of our race for the art of government are likely to be sorely tried in the immediate democratic future. For example, this is the kind of pessimistic prophecy I found in one of this month's leading reviews:—"A constitution of State in which the supreme power shall be given to the lower orders, in which they shall be clothed with the power to tax and to spend the money raised by taxation, whilst the wealthy class alone shall pay these taxes, this is, so far as I know, an experiment in Statecraft which has never been tried with any other result but one, viz., the determination of the majority to live upon their right of voting; it may be doubted whether there is anything in history—nay, more, whether there is anything in the nature of man, to justify the boundless hope and enthusiasm with which the experiment is regarded by many very influential persons." Well, what do you say to this? In the first place, I think you should say that the writer's statement that the experiment has never been tried with any other result but one is not true, for the experiment under similar conditions has never been tried at all. The truth is that the union of democratic principle with representative government is an entirely modern fact, which throws out of court, therefore, all historic precedent that might otherwise be appealed to. They have nothing but the word "democracy" in common; and, in the second place, I think we have a right to ask Sir Edward Fry to remember that we are Englishmen, and not to forget that we may be Christians. For after all, my friends, that last contingency is the all-important one, for if the English democracy of the future is not going to be a religious democracy, then God help us all. For myself, I am a social optimist, simply because I am a Christian; because I am not willing to take up the cry which the pessimist and the social cynic desires to put into my mouth. The sky is not black, but bright with the Christmas star, which announces the advent of a King, of a Ruler of men—Christ Jesus—not reigning merely supreme in far-off splendour in the glory of the heavenly palaces, but King in England to-day, by His Spirit inspiring, illuminating, transfiguring life, the great Companion, full of love and sympathy for all the sorrows and sufferings of the poor, full of care and concern also for the wider good of the commonwealth—the Reformer, the Emancipator of the captive and of the oppressed, the Champion of social right and the Inspirer of social duty. And I am a social optimist also because I am an Englishman; because I believe in what Burke once called "the inbred integrity and piety of the English people"; because it is bred into my very bone, as I expect it is bred into yours, that somehow with Englishmen things cannot go permanently wrong, but are bound to worry through in the end. There are dangers and difficulties ahead, of course—it would be foolish to deny that—but dangers are things to be faced, difficulties are things to be overcome. There is no use mincing matters—unless the world goes back democracy must go forward, the will of the people must more and more prevail. We cannot prevent numbers ruling; we can only try to teach them to rule well. And the Church of Christ, if it is to be of any use at all in the world, must take part in that work. She must not waste time in lamenting the mistakes of the past—and God knows the social errors and sins of the Church in its travesty of her Master's message of social salvation have been great—but she must address herself to the tasks of the future. She must begin that task by showing that the ideas which are stirring in democracy, the ideas which constitute its Divine justification, are the very same ideas which lie at the heart of the Christian religion. She must be ready also to recognise the the voice of her Master in that cry of the higher socialism which calls upon men to deny themselves for social good, and to place among the rights of individuals their duties to society; and I think she must not shrink also from sympathy, at least, with that optimistic faith which is, after all, the saving characteristic of the lower socialism. For all that virtue she can at least appeal, if it be only in such words as those which our modern poet puts into the mouth of the nation in his address to the great democracy of the West:

> Enslaved, illogical, elate,
> He greets the embarrassed Gods, nor fears
> To shake the iron hand of Fate,
> And Task with Destiny appears.

Lo! imperturbable he rules,
Unkempt, disreputable, vast;
And in the teeth of all the Schools,
Christ, Christ shall save him at the last.

The Church at least must let men know that her faith in the future of English democracy is but another name for her faith in human progress, a conviction born of our belief in the Incarnate Christ. The impulse which is hurrying the world on to new destinies is but God's appointed means of leading His children but one step nearer to the solution of that great educational problem which He has set men, of making His kingdom on earth a likeness of that which is in Heaven. And she must show men also that as it is through their religion that they may get the strongest motive for the obligations of their civic life, it is also from their religion that they will gain the best inspiration for any reforms of that civic life which may seem to them as true citizens to be things for which to strive. We who live in the country districts are already hoping that the action of the new Parish Councils will tend to revivify village life in England, and in the widest sense to make for the public health, the public wealth, and the public wisdom of our rural population; and you who live in the city, I suppose, expect some good results in the direction, at any rate, of poor-law administration from the democratising of the vestries and the Boards of Guardians. For my own part, I am not one of those people who expect as the result of the positions of these new Acts what Americans call "millennium by express." I do not, I hope, overestimate the disciplinary, the educational value of the new political machinery, for I believe one of the greatest political dangers of the present day is the exaggerated zeal with which the would-be social reformer is apt to rush for what he thinks will be the speedy extinction of some political enactment. True. there is much which the new democrat, impelled by that haste born sometimes of gaunt hunger, must of necessity sweep away; much foulness, commercial and industrial; much insincerity, social and political; much obstinate obstruction of a purely red-tape order, but in the end we need not fear that practical aims and policy will always remain for Englishmen the important thing. And that means a call for statesmen, for administrators, for the good all-round manager, with the blind eye for dangers, with the scorn for counting odds in a righteous cause, but also with a clear eye for the necessity of careful business-like administration, a scrupulous determination to be just, at whatever hazards, to maintain the right and confront the wrong at whatever risks. The fact is, we have to build up in England a new type of democratic politician and a new type of labour and industrial leaders. We have produced—during the last fifty years, shall I say?—admirable agitators, of the John the Baptist type, from John Bright down to John Burns, and they have most of them done noble preparatory work, but we have now to produce, if we can, and from the same classes, admirable administrators, who are quite a different kind of people, a new order of men, a new religious order, shall I say?—men who, whilst believing in the possibilities of democratic control, know how essential to efficient administration are all the qualities which are of Christian character, justice, patience, hope, modesty, integrity, frankness and fellowship. We want, in fact, as great a change, it seems to me, in our conception of the essential qualities which go to make an able public man, a vestry politician even, as Browning described in the wonderful picture he gave of the true function of a poet, which he called, "How it strikes a Contemporary." Indeed, now I come to think of it, I am not sure that Browning's poet is not quite the kind of man we want for our County Councillors and politicians. Do you remember Browning's lines?—

I only knew one poet in my life:
And this, or something like it, was his way.

You saw him up and down Valladolid,
A man of mark, to know next time you saw.
. . . . . .
He walked and tapped the pavement with his cane,
Scenting the world, looking it full in the face.
. . . . . .
He turned up, now, the alley by the church,
That leads nowhither; now, he breathed himself
On the main promenade just at the wrong time,
You'd come upon his scrutinising hat,
Making a peaked shade blacker than it self
Against the single window spared some house
Intact yet with its mouldered Moorish work,—
Or else surprise the ferrule of his stick
Trying the mortar's temper 'tween the chinks
Of some new shop a-building, French and fine.
He stood and watched the cobbler at his trade.
. . . . . .
He glanced o'er books on stalls with half an eye,
And fly-leaf ballads on the vendor's string,
And broad-edge, bold-print posters by the wall.
He took such cognisance of men and things,
If any beat a horse, you felt he saw;
If any cursed a woman, he took note;
Yet stared at nobody,—you stared at him,
And found, less to your pleasure than surprise,
He seemed to know you and expect as much—
The town's true master if the town but knew!
We merely kept a governor for form,
While this man walked about and took account
Of all thought, said and acted, then went home,
And wrote it fully to our Lord the King.

Our Lord the King! Is He whom you call Lord in any sense, do you think, King of this city? What are you and I doing to make His lordship felt in our city life? What are we doing to make His laws supreme, and His spirit supreme in our civic politics? It is the duty of that Church and Church people, is it not, to be that kind of poet-prophet they used to call it in the old days—the interpreter of life to the people for our Lord the King. Surely it is the duty of the Church to insist that civic administration shall be undertaken in the spirit of service to our Lord the King. It is

her duty as an interpreter of life, as a preacher of Christ's kingdom on earth, to speak in such manner that everyone shall feel that he is bound by honour and by Christian obligation to build up so far as he can the life of the great civic brotherhood to which he belongs, and of every sphere of action which it contains, in justice, righteousness, and according to the will of God. My friends, when Christ came, He bent over the courts of the dead world and whispered a word of faith over the clay which had lost all of Man but the movement and the form. He uttered words until then almost unknown—Love, Service, Sacrifice, Duty—and the dead arose. A new life circulated through the dead body which ancient philosophy had tried all in vain to reanimate: from that dead Society arose the Christian world, the world of Liberty, Equality, Brotherhood. When Christ came and changed the face of the world, He spake not of the rights of the rich, who laboured not to achieve them, nor to the poor, who doubtless would have abused them in imitation of the rich: He spoke not of utility or interest to a people whom interest and cruelty had corrupted—He spoke of Duty and Service. He said they should be first among all who had contributed most by their labour to the good of all. He taught that life meant service, work for God and His world, work for Christ and His kingdom. He taught that the reward of work was work, not wages only, but further opportunities of duty. "To him that hath shall be given," He said—given something more than to sit down and enjoy the results of his labour, given a wider sphere of activity and an extending range of opportunity and duty—heaven itself is only work to surer issues.

God grant, my friends, that something of that true happiness of life may be yours, that ever you may be pressing on into new worlds of happy daring, into the enjoyments of new hopes, into new deeds of service and duty, so that whether it may fall to your lot to spend yourself in public life or in private life for your Lord the King, you may ever be learning through new experiences, social, and individual—

> How beautiful it is to be alive!
> To wake each morn as if the Maker's grace
> Did so afresh from nothingness derive,
> That we might sing, "How happy is our case,
> How beautiful it is to be alive!"
>
> And ever trace man's height of nobleness—
> Strive still some new progression to contrive,
> Till just as any other friend's we press
> Death's hand, and when we die feel none the less,
> "How beautiful it is to be alive!"

It is not often that a Bishop acts as a missioner. A mission was held, however, during Holy Week by the Bishop of Killaloe, Dr. Wynne. The Bishop preached every day, and it is stated that the services were attended by many Nonconformists. The mission was brought to a close on Easter Day.

OBSERVANCE OF LENT.

By Ven. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Westminster.

Preached at the Mid-day Service in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, on Ash Wednesday, February 27th, 1895.

As my object this morning is to be as simple and practical as I can, I will choose no text, but will endeavour very briefly to consider, rather in the form of suggestions than of a full and formal address, these three things. First, Why we ought to observe Lent? Next, How we should try to observe it? And, thirdly, the end and object before us. Now, as to the reason why we should observe Lent at all I would say, first, because we are members of the Church of England, and therefore that it is neither wise nor right for us to neglect the indications which the Church to which we belong has to give us. The Church's year is beautifully divided, one-half of it being devoted to a consideration of the events in the life of our Lord, and the other half being expressly devoted to teaching and to our practical duties; and as the Church has put aside this period of the year, we ought not to let it become a mere dead anachronism, or a mere idle name, but try to give some reality and meaning to it. Secondly, we ought to observe Lent because, as on Good Friday we remember our Lord's crucifixion, and as on Easter Sunday we commemorate His resurrection, and as we commemorate His birth and presentation in the Temple and the other great events of His life, so ought we certainly to notice that great epoch of His life which consisted of a forty days' temptation in the wilderness. A third reason why we should observe Lent is because from the very earliest days, although Lent was kept in various manners, still it has always been set apart as a season of special thought and preparation. It is unwise to create any wilful discontinuity between the past and the present, and we ought to reverence an observance which is nearly as old as Christendom itself. Then, as a fourth reason, I would mention that one object why Lent was set apart for special observance was because it was regarded in some countries as being a season of the year which specially needed watchfulness. That may be much less the case with us than it is in Southern and Eastern climes. But even in England the poet sings that

> In the Spring a livelier iris changes on the burnish'd dove,
> In the Spring a young man's fancy lightly turns to thoughts of love.

And we may regard spring, therefore, as being a very suitable time of the year for watchfulness and for preparation. But if spring has no special significance in that way for us in these more

northern climates, at any rate it is most desirable that one part of the year should be specially regarded as a time for watchfulness and self-conquest; as a time in which we should, to the best of our power, exercise the dangerous and even fatal fascinations of the world; as a time when we should prevent ourselves, as far as possible, from being dazzled by its splendours, or being misled by its many vanities. For these reasons, then, I think that every one of us ought to make some difference between Lent and other seasons of the year.

And so we pass to the next question, How are we to observe Lent? Now, I wish strongly to impress upon you the fact that as to details the Church of England, following the example of almost every other branch of the Church of God, has left us entirely free. I would not ask you to take my authority for that, but I will quote to you the words of one of the earliest Church historians. The historian Socrates, in the fourth century after Christ, says that since no one can show any written rules about fasting, it is plain that the apostles left this matter free to each man's judgment and choice, that no one should do a good thing through fear and necessity. In point of fact, as far back as the second century, in the days of St. Irenæus, it was more customary to observe abstinence or fasting in Lent for forty hours than for forty days. But although we are left absolutely free as to details I would earnestly, as your brother in the Church of God, recommend to each person, first of all, to have a definite plan, perhaps known to no human being but himself, as to how he can best make the season of Lent beneficial to himself and beneficent to others. And, next, I would advise you very earnestly to fix each for yourselves upon some definite form of self-denial. Even if it be a small and external one, the mere fact of its being a chosen self-denial cannot but have an excellent effect upon our own characters. I know, for instance, of many young men who, during the season of Lent, determined that they would give up all smoking. I know of others who, during the season of Lent, practised a form of self-denial which was very common in the ancient Church by never touching any fermented drink. Now, in both these things they are exercising a wise self-denial, because the tendency often is, especially in young men, to make the self-indulgence of smoking one which is carried to excess and becomes injurious to their health, and also because, even without knowing it, one may very easily get an ugly fondness for alcohol; and because, by the testimony of the greatest physicians, it is not a necessity to health, and is very often a distinct injury to it. But if any of us practice such small forms of self-denial, I would add it is exceedingly desirable that what they can save from this self-indulgence they should give in alms to the poor or to some good purpose.

Then, besides keeping Lent with a definite plan and with definite self-denial, I would earnestly urge upon you not to let it become a mere outward form. We must not have so mean a notion of God as to suppose that He cares for any merely external observance on our part. Every form of observing Lent is absolutely worthless unless it makes us really better, less frivolous, less censorious, less self-indulgent, more humble, more loving, and more serviceable. To fast and to continue to tell lies about our brethren; to fast and indulge ourselves in perpetual sneers and calumnies against our brethren; to fast and to make no effort against those sins which so easily beset us, is not to earn that blessed sentence, "Well done, good and faithful servant," but far rather to earn that terrible warning, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within are full of extortion and excess."

As to another way of keeping Lent. I would say that all have the opportunity of attending special services throughout this season; and it would be well, as far as possible, to take advantage of such services. For instance, in this church, for members of the congregation and business men, there will be these services at a quarter past one, with special preachers, to whom I am sure you will listen with deep interest and profit. Also there will be services at eight o'clock in the evening, with special preachers and subjects. Again, it may have happened to you, in the course of time, to have grown careless in your attendance upon Holy Communion; and how valuable it would be if you were able to deny yourself and to come to the early Communion every Sunday morning.

Then, also, we can all, unknown perhaps to anybody but ourselves, keep Lent by making it a time for deeper thought and meditation. We all of us do so many things that we much condemn; but we forget the one thing needful. George Herbert says:

> Bright verdure fringes the small desert fountain,
> But barren sand the sea.

The small desert fountain, in its untroubled stillness, is the eye and the gem of the wilderness, mirroring the blue of heaven, feeding the lilies with the dew upon its margin, and broidering its edge with flowers. But the sand is barren of flowers where the restless and quick-recurring surf, daily beating, wastes its scum of yesterday upon the shore; and only at its far edge, where the waves scarcely beat, will a few rushes grow. And it is the same with our lives. Our daily burdens of worldly duty, and even the daily recurring obligations of religion, too often leave us no time for real intercourse with our God. We have spent so many hours in talk, and so many hours in earning our bread; so many hours in meals, and so many hours in sleep, and so many hours in

trying to heap up riches for the future; but how many do we give earnestly and heartily to God?

> The world is too much with us: late and soon,
> Getting and spending we lay waste our powers.

It was far different in earlier days. We are told of two hermits who met together and agreed that they would spend so much time every day in thought and in the study of the Scripture; and they began the 39th Psalm, "I said I will take heed to my ways that I offend not with my tongue." When, some time after, they met, one of them asked the other how far he had got in the study of the Scripture; and he replied: "I have got no further than one verse; I find so much in it against which I constantly offend, that it has occupied all my thoughts since then." And when an old Carthusian monk was asked how he could possibly get through his day, his answer was, "I have thought of ancient days and the years of ancient times." We all of us neglect far too much the duty of private meditation, and Lent furnishes us with fresh opportunities for cultivating it.

In conclusion, let me give one or two hints as to the end and object we should have before us in keeping Lent. First, I should say, it is the deepening of our seriousness. We all need more devotion and more reverence; we all need to think more seriously of those three things—death, judgment, eternity. The warnings of death are around us every day and on every side; and when men die they must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; and the things eternal are not the things of the future, only things unseen. They are as much present now as they will be after death. It is the object of faith to see those things invisible, and to live in the midst of the things eternal even now. That which keeps us from these things is pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness. No prophet will teach us better how to observe Lent than the great prophet Isaiah; and he says: "The harp and the viol, the tabret, and pipe, and wine are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of His hands."

Then I would say that Lent may teach us all more humility. Humility is, to my mind, the very rarest of all Christian virtues. If you see a man humble, whatever may be his faults, you may be quite sure that he is a good man. Humility is a violet which can be only sought and gathered at the foot of the cross. Even great heathens have felt the necessity of humbling themselves to remind them that after all they were but the creatures of a day. If the great Emperor Augustus fixed one day every year in which he went out and begged in the streets to remind him how brief and how vain is the life of man, surely we Christians may take one season in the year to bring us more humbly to our knees, and impress upon our minds the sense of our own absolute insignificance before the eternal and infinite God whom we worship.

Besides seriousness and humility, we surely may greatly benefit by self-conquest. I never heard a better way of keeping Lent than that practised by the great St. Gregory of Nazianzen, who was present at the second great Œcumenical Council of the world. Feeling he was tempted by a quick and irritable temperament to use severe and bitter words, he determined that his Lent should be devoted to curing himself of that bad habit; he therefore made it a rule that during the whole of Lent he would not speak one single unnecessary word, that he might wrestle with and conquer that temptation to speak too hastily and too bitterly. If in the same way we devote Lent to struggling with those sins to which we are most prone, we cannot fail to have kept it well.

Once more, besides seriousness, and humility, and self-conquest, I would mention the necessity of service. As I have said before, Lent would be useless if our self-denial is not of any advantage to our brother man. All the duties of life are summed up in two monosyllables, Love, serve—love God, and serve your fellow-man. If we can serve in no other way we can serve by giving. It may help us to conquer that love of money which is the root of all kinds of evil if in Lent we train ourselves habitually to the custom of greater generosity towards our suffering fellow-men. "To do good, and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

Perhaps you will wonder that I have said nothing to you about fasting. It is too large a subject upon which to enter here. But I believe there are very many serious errors held, and a great deal that is false and even nonsensical talked about it. One of the greatest of English Bishops, Jeremy Taylor, said fasting is for some persons, and for some circumstances, and for some times. As the Church of England gives us our choice between fasting and abstinence, which does not mean only abstinence from food, but abstinence from every kind of evil, the best fasting we can always practice is habitual moderation, habitual temperance in eating and in drinking; the best abstinence we can possibly practice is the abstinence from all those things which we know are offensive to God and injurious to our neighbour. Let me read you the words of another great father, St. Chrysostom. He says: "If one say to thee I have fasted all Lent, say thou to him I had an enemy, but I am reconciled to him; I had a base habit of detraction, but I have left it off; I had an ungodly custom of swearing, but now it is abandoned." And if you desire another authority, let me read you a passage from the Shepherd of Hermas' book, which was so dear to Christians in the second, third, and fourth centuries that it was actually read in the churches as inspired Scripture. Hermas tells us that he was one day sitting upon a mountain fasting, and the Good Shepherd came to him and sat by his side, and this conversation took

place between them. The Good Shepherd said to him, 'Why hast thou come hither so early in the morning?' 'I am keeping a station, sir,' I said. 'What is a station?' He asked. 'I am fasting, sir,' I said. 'What is this fasting for,' He continued, 'which you are observing?' 'I fast, sir, as I have been accustomed to do.' Then answered the Good Shepherd, 'You do not know how to fast unto the Lord. This useless fasting you observe to Him is of no value.' 'Why do you say this?' I asked. 'I say to you,' answered the Good Shepherd, 'that the fasting you think you observe is no fasting.' Listen: God does not desire such an empty fasting, for fasting to God in this way you will do nothing for a righteous life, but offer to God a fasting such as this: do no evil in your life; serve the Lord with a pure heart; keep His commandments; let no wicked desire arise in your heart; believe in God. If you do these things you will live unto God, and you will keep a great fast and one acceptable unto God. Come, let me tell you, He said, an allegory. There was a much-loved slave, He continued, whom his master told to stake the vines in his vineyard; and he tied all the vines to a stick; but, after all, he weeded the vineyard and dug it up, and his master was pleased with his services that he made him co-heir with his son. And then, the Good Shepherd continued fasting, only becomes good when kept with blessed service and abstinence from every evil word and every evil thought, and from the vanities of the world."

Is not that lesson identical with that which you heard in the second lesson of this morning's service from the great prophet Isaiah, "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? To lose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke"? And you will find in the Scriptures the amplest rules for making Lent profitable. Let us endeavour not to throw away the opportunity, and to ask God's blessing upon it.

It does not appear from the reports in the Church papers that the Easter services this year presented many novelties. The celebrations of Holy Communion were numerous in churches where only the most moderate ritual prevails, as many as five being not at all uncommon. We have not received many returns of the number of communicants, and perhaps this is a form of "numbering the people," which it is not desirable to encourage. We note, however, that at St. James's, Hatcham, once notorious for Mr. Arthur Tooth's conflict with his churchwardens on the subject of ritual, but where a very different *régime* now prevails, as many as 1,118 communicants were registered, of whom 27 per cent. were men. Floral decorations are certainly much more common and elaborate than in former years, and have quite ceased to be an adjunct of High ritual or of extreme doctrine in the pulpit.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1895.

THE POPE'S PASTORAL AND REUNION.

THE Pastoral Epistle which the Pope has addressed "to all Englishmen who glory in the Christian name" is a document full of interest, as much for what it omits as for what it contains. It is full of recognition of the various virtues which are displayed by the English character, and shows much sympathy with the attempts we have made to grapple with many important social and religious problems. Leo XIII. is a genial and lovable old man, totally free from ecclesiastical pride and bigotry, and he is very willing to admit that though we do not all belong to his fold, we are not morally much the worse for it; and his heart is set on winning us back to what he regards as our only lawful obedience. For this laudable end he asks the prayers of the faithful. And there he stops. His desire for reunion is sincere, his hopes of it are enthusiastic. But it has not apparently occurred to him that he can take any active steps to bring it about. There is not a hint in his affectionate epistle of any concessions in either doctrine or discipline. Re-union with Rome must be on Rome's own terms, and English people must not only receive back again what they cast off at the Reformation, but the added dogmas of Papal Infallibility, Immaculate Conception, and so forth, which the Roman Church has promulgated since. The historical facts of the Reformation, and all that led up to it, must be ignored; we must part with our claim to catholicity and with the dear traditions of our National Church, and sink into the position of a Roman Church.

So pass the fond hopes of re-union, which some sincere Englishmen have for some time past in-

dulged. If the expression may be allowed, re-union has been "boomed" lately; and some enthusiasts, in their charitable anxiety to recognise what seemed due to the Church of Rome, seemed even to be in danger of forgetting something of what was owed to the Church of England. The sentiments expressed by Lord Halifax were by no means shared even by all the members of the union over which he presides. It was pointed out in these columns that such hopes were futile, that absorption was the only kind of re-union which Rome would tolerate—that, in fact, the lamb would have to lie down inside the lion. And that appears to be the view of Leo. XIII., though he is a very lamb-like lion, we must confess, and roars in his pastoral as gently as any sucking-dove. What else could Rome do we should like to know? The positions of Romanism and of Anglicanism are absolutely irreconcilable. The Church of England claims to be a true branch of the Holy Catholic Church, with valid orders and valid sacraments, and the sacred deposit of Christian truth. It appeals to history in confirmation of its claims and in justification of its attitude of independence; it points to certain important Roman tenets as contrary to Scripture and tradition, heretical, and mischievous. On the other hand, Romanism denies the very fundamentals of the Anglican position, repudiates its orders, its sacraments, its catholicity, brands it as heretical and schismatic, and it does all this as clothed with infallible and Divine authority, claiming for its spiritual head supreme authority over the Church in the name of Christ. The Roman claims are absolutely incompatible with even the most maimed and mutilated existence of the English Church. At the same time Romanism must stand or fall by its own claims. If the Pope is supreme and infallible pastor and vicar of God on earth, then he can part with none of his authority; if he is not, then the tradition of the Roman Church passes away, and the position of its Bishops falls to one of merely local importance, which is all that we can ascribe to it. The truth is, that re-union involves an effort, not only towards Roman recognition of Anglicanism, but Anglican recognition of Rome. And the one is as hopeless as the other.

The conclusion of the Papal Pastoral only widens the gulf between the Churches, containing, as it does, a description of our country as "Mary's dowry," and a prayer to the Virgin for her special good offices in our peculiar case. All this, with the promise of 300 days' indulgence to those who faithfully recite the prayer, displays the unchangeable obstinacy of the Vatican, which learns nothing and forgets nothing. From his hermit-like retirement the Pope sends out his messages to an unlistening world, the change and progress of which he is either ignorant of, or ignores. The wide divergencies in religious thought, the tremendous advance in ideas of freedom and independence, the vast national changes and upheavals, have found no echo in the gardens of the Vatican. A complete revolution must take place in the heart of the Papacy before any real move can be made towards re-union.

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM ON PEACE.

THE Bishop of Durham (Dr. Westcott) in a recent speech, said that when he looked back to the time of his schooldays, spent in Birmingham some fifty years ago, he could not but feel that he was living now in what was practically a new world. Looking, for instance, at the different conceptions of patriotism then and now, he believed Englishmen were as true patriots as their forefathers, but in what a different sense did they fulfil that noble characteristic. The one thought, at the time of his schooldays, was that of the dominance of England. The one desire was that all nations should imitate us—as if we were the one type of humanity; but we had learned in the last half-century a very different lesson. It was recognised now that God in His great wisdom had assigned to other nations other parts, perhaps equally as necessary as that part assigned to us, for the fulfilment of the one idea of humanity. We had learned that there was one law of life, one test and standard of greatness, both for man and for nations. That standard was not how much a man or a nation had claimed and got for himself, but what service the man or nation had rendered to others. An illustration of the change to which he had referred was to be seen in regard to the practice of Duelling. When he was a boy it was common in England. Now it was universally condemned, because it was felt that a man's life was not his own to dispose of, but was to him an opportunity for service. When looking back over the last half-century, he also recognised how International Congresses on different subjects of common interest had enabled nations to feel far more powerfully than before the great factors of international communication and international duty. Had not all of them within the last few years rejoiced in the power exercised by wise and conciliatory diplomacy in the great triumphs of Arbitration in the case of the Alabama, and recently again in the case of the dispute as to Behring's Straits. During the last five or six years successive measures had been brought forward to establish an Arbitration Treaty between the United States and England. If England and the United States were once united in such a compact, the peace of the whole world would be well assured. Increasing attention was now paid to the proceedings of the International Peace Congress by the press, and definite measures were now brought forward and seriously discussed. Proposals were made, and he earnestly trusted that they would take a more definite form,

especially for Partial Disarmament, while another proposal which deserved most serious attention was that some period should be fixed between, if it must happen, the declaration of war and the commencement of the actual operations. Such a Partial Truce might often be blest with peace. Strong hopes were expressed that an International Tribunal for the settlement of disputes might be established in Europe. Towards the securing of the end they had in view, each one of those present had something to do. Each one could help towards the substituting of "the force of right for the right of force." There was nothing but their Christian faith which could enable them to overcome temptations, to show their strength, and to enable them to bear sad delays and disappointments which must necessarily hinder the fulfilment of their hopes. The Society of Friends, or Quakers, out of all proportion to their numbers, had been able to do much in the cause of Peace; and it was only through the loving combination and the brotherhood of such believers that we can find the solid foundation for our faith in the brotherhood of man.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE *Church Review* draws attention to the significant fact that the largest number of communicants on Easter Day in any Church out of London (where in only three or four cases did the numbers run into four figures) was at St. John's, Cardiff—a singular sign of a decaying Church! The communicants were 992.

Easter eggs were in evidence at two churches in the City. At St. Mary Woolnoth, Lombard Street, coloured eggs—real eggs, hard boiled—each bearing the words "My Redeemer," were distributed to the congregation as they left. The custom was referred to by the Rector, the Rev. J. M. S. Brooke, in his sermon as a very old one, dating as far back as 1295, the egg being, he said, the great symbol of the Resurrection. The other case was at the Church of St. Mary-at-Hill, where the eggs, brought by members of the congregation, were distributed to the poor.

The Universities Mission to Central Africa has offered the post of successor to the late Bishop Smythies to the Rev. Ronald Robert Wynn Griffith, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Walsall. Mr. Griffith graduated at Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1880, and was ordained in 1881 to the curacy of St. Mary's, Sedgley, where he remained for eight years. He was preferred to St. Andrew's, Walsall, in 1889.

The consecration of the Rev. J. R. Harmer to the bishopric of Adelaide is fixed for Ascension Day, May 23rd.

The Rev. A. E. Joscelyne, B.D., senior curate of St. George-in-the-East, has been appointed by the trustees to the vicarage of St. George's, Millom, a busy, mining parish of Cumberland. Mr. Joscelyne has been working for about five years at St. George-in-the-East, and at the recent elections was returned both as Vestryman and Guardian for that parish.

The Crown living of St. Peter's, St. Albans, has been conferred upon the Rev. Robert A. Squires, for many years a missionary of the Church Missionary Society at Bombay, and, since his return from India, one of the assistant clergy of Holy Trinity, Tunbridge Wells. The *English Churchman* is informed that the appointment by Lord Rosebery of an Evangelical is due to the strong representations made to him by members of the congregation.

Dean Vaughan's friends in London will be pleased to hear that he was able to preach in Llandaff Cathedral on Easter morning. It need hardly be said that there was a very large congregation. Dr. Vaughan appeared to be somewhat infirm, but his voice was distinctly heard all over the church. He also read the second Lesson, and officiated at the celebration of the Holy Communion.

The congregation of St. Philip's, Birmingham, of which Dr. Knox, the Bishop of Coventry, is the rector, declines to pay for elaborate music, and it may be supposed, therefore, that the members do not care for it. The cost of the choir is about £300 a year, and it was largely contributed to by the late rector, Bishop Bowlby. Dr. Knox told his people lately that he was unable to follow his predecessor's example, but they could continue to have the musical services as heretofore if they were prepared to defray the expense. A circular was then sent round to the seat-holders inviting subscriptions, but the response was unsatisfactory, and six members of the choir have given notice of their intention to leave.

Some correspondence has appeared in a morning paper regarding the alleged exclusiveness of the Girls' Friendly Society. The exclusiveness consists in the fact that ladies belonging to Nonconformist bodies are by the rules debarred from taking part in the management. It is a testimony to the good work the society is doing that such ladies should desire to be associated with it, but does it not occur to them that its efficiency is largely due to the fact that it is not what is called unsectarian? The fact that the society is a distinctly Church society—though it is not, as one of its critics asserts, "used for narrow Church purposes"—enables the lady associates to exercise a kindly supervision over the young women entrusted to their care, which would be impossible if the girls were members of half a-dozen denominations, and went to half-a-dozen different places of worship. It is to be regretted, no doubt, that there should be two societies of a similar character in villages where one would be ample provision, but then it is equally to be regretted that there should be three or four places of worship in a village when one would accommodate all the worshippers. While "our unhappy divisions" continue, we cannot expect to escape their natural consequences.

The Dean of Rochester, who has been much interviewed since his return from America, has been interrogated upon some burning questions of the day by a representative of the *Christian Commonwealth*. Asked for his opinion on Lord Halifax's visit to Rome and re-union with the Papacy, Dr. Hole said:—"Rome is so unbending, and we are not going to believe in the infallibility of the Pope or the celibacy of the clergy." The Dean is not hopeful of any great practical outcome from the Grindelwald gatherings. "The way to get re-union," he remarked, "is for each man to live up to his light, do the best he can, and pray the Master's prayer that we may all be one. Then in His own good time re-union will come."

Dr. Hole was asked why he had said such strong

things about Broad Churchmen? His answer was: "Because they are so indefinite. They are, too, too self-satisfied; they patronise the High Church, they patronise the Low; but they think they have the golden truth themselves. I do not understand them. They are neither flesh, fish, fowl, nor good red herring. No doubt a great many of them do a large amount of good, but I like a man to be zealous and definite, even when he differs from me."

The "May Meetings" began last week in the case of a few religious societies, though, as usual, the big gatherings will not take place till after May has begun. We are glad to see that the S.P.C.K. is to have a meeting in St. James's Hall on Friday, May 24th. The Archbishop of Canterbury will take the chair at 2.30 p.m., and the other speakers will include the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Bath and Wells (late of Adelaide), Bishop Selwyn, and Canon Scott-Holland.

THE ASCENT OF MAN.

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., stated:—

Professor Darwin held that it was a grander view of life to regard God as having given life to a few forms, or one only; and Professor Leibnitz thought that it was easier to conceive of their originating by degrees in this way than to regard them as perfectly formed. Really, if we look at the matter aright, it is not honourable to God, nor an easier thought for man, that the Almighty begins everything and completes nothing. To talk of Him being weary, not having will nor time, and having too much respect for Himself to do more than make a little cell, about the tenth of a line in diameter, or only the vital point in it, is not worshipful.

Evolution is used as a general name for the history of the morphological and physiological development of any and every living thing. It is said: "The whole world, living and unliving, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to laws, of the forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed." There is no proof; it is sheer hypothesis. The matter and force of the world do not of themselves make anything. The wisest and most scientific men hold that God is and was all in all, creating, shaping, replenishing the worlds, without partner, helper, or counsellor. He made the heavens and the earth, every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew. There was one primordial form, or picture, or idea, in the Divine mind which embraced the whole. We thus obtain a sacred, scientific, accurate and comprehensive idea, which confirms faith and gives new power and beauty to science; whereas, to put the rose, with its elegant form, beautiful colour, and delicious scent, into the primal haze, makes ourselves hazy indeed. This general haze, about which so many are misty, and the primordial life, of which science is wholly ignorant, may be thus thought of:—"The nebulous haze, not always massed, was generally diffused. Brought together, say, into those aggregations of which, we are told, suns and planets were made, by condensation and separation, they represent that chaos out of which, by development, the existing worlds were created." Thus modern science has badly put before us—by the perverseness of those professors who stagger at the idea of creation—as new facts, that which Scripture relates as a grand old series of wonderful truths.

Take the embryo of man. Before there was any shaping it, there were initial processes in the lower parts of the earth. We all know this very well. There was also an eventful passage, in the course of a few months, from the early cell to the infant's formed body. This some call a representative, abbreviated process of life's grand advance from the very beginning. We maintain the contrary. The particles of which the infant is composed never did pass through those stages. The embryo never was and never is by a perpetual unrolling or evolving from former states long since dead, of inner capabilities, some of which were never possessed. Neither mechanical nor organic processes work or are worked apart from a plan vast as the universe, nor apart from effects lasting the whole of time. The experience of life and of true science shows that all forces tend to further States, places, operations, and are parts of one great plan. Science reveals, as one of its greatest truths, that the force of nature at large, or of any organism, is not of its own making or gaining, as if nature selected, or organic arrangements were made by nature, or by a thing itself. To say the sun equips himself with heat, light, and the power of marvellous chemistry, is not less mad than to assert that the stomach has power to grow corn, that the lungs and the heart know how to constitute the atmosphere, and precisely where to place the valves in our arteries and veins.

"The Higher Ascent of Man" will be the next subject.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DR. DRUMMOND'S HIBBERT LECTURES.

SIR,—Dr. Drummond, in his Hibbert Lectures delivered last year, observes:—

"If we attempt to judge the New Testament as we would the original documents of any other religion, we cannot but be struck with the fact that the very phraseology which is necessary to express the doctrine of the Trinity is absent . . . . and we are forced to the conclusion that . . . . it formed no essential part of the primitive Gospel, and that . . . . it stands in marked opposition to the kind of teaching which Jesus Himself preferred."

Now the sceptical writer Strauss, whose work, as Dr. Wace says, "aroused anxiety throughout Europe," declares: "We have every reason for supposing that of all the Gospels Matthew's is the one which brings before our eyes, in its earliest form, the figure of Christ as it lived in the most ancient Church." "We, as well as Baur, have always considered, and still do consider, the Gospel of Matthew as the most original." ("New Life of Jesus," I., 152, 183.) Bishop Wordsworth says: "It may be reasonably inferred that the *first written* Gospel would be designed especially for the *Jews*, and that the Gospel which, from internal evidence, appears to have been designed specially for *Jewish* use was the *first written*. . . . . The Gospel of *St. Matthew* proclaims itself, by its matter and manner, to have been composed for the benefit of the

Jews. . . . . This . . . . points it out as the first written of the four Evangelical histories. We find that this inference is confirmed by the testimony of Christian antiquity."

Thus all men appear to be agreed as to the granitic character of St. Matthew's Gospel. It is obvious, moreover, to any careful critic that, breathing throughout, as it does, the doom of Judaism, this document could only belong to that "wicked generation" which was overtaken by the sore judgment of the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70 (Matt. iii. 7, xii. 39-45, xxiii. 34-39, xxiv. 33-35). Let us, then, examine this "original document" of the Christian religion with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. What does it say? Why, in Matthew xi. 27, we find: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." If "the Father" be Divine, surely "the Son," who alone knows and alone reveals "the Father" to mankind, must be Divine also. Again, in Matthew xii. 31, 32: "The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. . . . . Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." There can be no question that by "the Son of Man" our Lord Himself ("the Son" of Matthew xi. 27; see also verse 19) is indicated. Hence, if "the Son" be Divine, the Holy Ghost must necessarily be Divine also. Moreover, the Holy Ghost is described in our Lord's great primary charge to His Apostles (Matt. x. 20) as "the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you;" and again, as "the Spirit of God" (Matt. xii. 28). These passages are *all* taken from our Lord's *own* discourses.

How, then, can Dr. Drummond maintain that the doctrine of the Trinity "stands in marked opposition to the kind of teaching which Jesus Himself preferred"? On the contrary, the doctrine of the Trinity seems not only to have "formed" a very "essential part of the primitive Gospel," but to have formed the *very foundation* of the *whole* of Christ's teaching; and how can Dr. Drummond declare that "the very phraseology which is necessary to express the doctrine of the Trinity is absent from the New Testament"—from "the original documents" of our religion? Do not the terms "Son of God," "My Father," and "Holy Ghost" occur, each of them, several times at least, in St. Matthew's Gospel? (Matt. iv. 6, viii. 29, xvi. 16, xi. 27, xii. 50, xvi. 17, i. 20, iii. 11, xii. 32). The Messiah was to come as "the King of Israel" (Matt. xxvii. 42). the unique representative of God upon earth, and the redeeming Head of all mankind (Matt. ix. 4-8, xxii. 41-45), and to "baptise with the Holy Ghost" (Matt. iii. 11). Even in the Old Testament, all-important as it was to guard and emphasise the unity of the Godhead, when the whole pagan world was wallowing in the degradation of polytheism, the foundations of the doctrine of the Trinity were firmly laid, not only in the plural form of the Divine Name (*Elohim*)—"Let *us* make man in *our* image" (Gen. i. 26)—but in the important action ever attributed throughout the sacred writings to "the Word of the Lord" and to "the Spirit of the Lord."

It is clear, therefore, that the doctrine of the Trinity, which is implicitly contained in the Old Testament, lies at the root of our Lord's own teaching, and is to be found woven into the texture of St. Matthew's Gospel—an "original document," composed in the lifetime of those who had actually been the hearers of our Lord Himself.

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 20th, 1895.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

SIR,—Having been a careful reader of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT for many years now, and having read under the Reviews and Notices this week (1,006), the article on "Higher Criticism," may I call your many readers' attention to the back numbers of 1891, to some valuable articles written on this subject by the late Prebendary Francis Tilney Bassett, which are thoughtful, learned, and spiritual?

S. T. B.

April 8th, 1895.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—The Triumphant Entry of Christ. Read Mark xi. 11. Introduction.—The time of our blessed Lord and Saviour was getting short; very soon He was to give His sacred life on the cross for our sake. We notice a few thoughts from this subject:—1. *The command of Jesus.*—When Jesus was nearing Jerusalem He sent forth two of His disciples to go into a village at some little distance, and they would see a colt tied on which no one ever sat before. They were told, if any one should make mention why they were liberating the colt, they were to say that the Lord had need of him (verses 1-4). 2. *The people's reception.*—The people, no doubt, had heard that Jesus was coming; they, therefore, began to spread their garments in the way, or line of thoroughfare; others cut down branches of the trees, like as when any great personage was to pass along the road. Their excitement and feelings for the time knew no bounds (verses 7, 8). 3. *The people's exclamation.*—They gave vent to their feelings amid a burst of applause; they followed in the procession as Jesus rode along, saying, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord" (verse 9). Further, they said, "Hosanna in the highest." Perhaps there were those who sang and used these words, then forgot their zeal when He was cruelly treated and delivered up to death. But thus it behoveth Christ to suffer the reproach of men. 4. *Jesu's entry into Jerusalem.*—The time came when Jesus entered Jerusalem and into the Temple, and took a look at the things around Him; and then, as it was getting late, retired to Bethany with the twelve until to-morrow. No doubt our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ watched and looked around on things and persons with the greatest concern. He knew what was in man, and needeth not to be told by any. But sure we may be that He was, step by step, fulfilling the stupendous mission He came to this earth of ours to accomplish:

> See the destined day arise;
> See, a willing Sacrifice;
> Jesus, to redeem our loss,
> Hangs upon the shameful Cross!

Ah, brethren, in all the stages of the Saviour's life, when He trod this earth of ours was one of unbroken endurance of suffering, which culminated on the cross for our sakes.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bevan, Rev. William Latham, M.A., Vicar of Hay, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. David's; Archdeacon of Brecon.

Bingham, Rev. A., B.A., Curate of St. Marylebone; Chaplain of the Hostel of St. Luke, Nottingham-place.

Bowen, Rev. D., B.A., Vicar of Cowbridge; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Glamorganshire (Mr. R. Thurstaw Bassett).

Boyer, Rev. Richard, M.A., Curate of Witchampton; Incumbent of the Wisbech Chapel-of-Ease.

Brown, Rev. Joseph Thomas, M.A., Rector of St. Paul's, Wokingham, Berks, and Rural Dean of the Sonning Deanery; Honorary Canon of Christ Church Cathedral.

Butler, Rev. C. E., M.A., Rector of Westbere; Rector of Hotham, Yorks.

Carpenter, Rev. Edward Stanley, M.A.; Vicar of Highcliffe, Hants.

Chippett, Rev. James William, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.

Copleston, Rev. J. H., M.A, Rector of Offwell; Rural Dean of Honiton and Dunkerwell.

Darby, Rev. Edward George, B.A., Vicar of Billericay; Rural Dean of Ingatestone.

Dobree, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Worksop; R.D. Secretary of the Church Army for the Deanery of Worksop.

Dowding, Rev. W. B., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class.

Dowling, Rev. Theodore E., Jerusalem; Local Commissary for Bishop Blyth in Palestine and Syria.

Evans, Rev. Henry C., A.K.C., Senior Curate of St. Stephen's, Bow, E.; Rector of Denton, Kent.

Farrar, Ven. F. W., D.D., Rector of St. Margaret's and Archdeacon of Westminster; Dean of Canterbury, also Chaplain to the House of Commons.

Greenway, Rev. Henry, Curate of All Hallows', East India Docks; Incumbent of the New District of Northfield, Rotherham.

Hales, Rev. Greville T., M.A., Vicar of Ardleigh, Essex; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cumberland.

Hemsted, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Aidan's Chapel, Stagshaw, Northumberland; Vicar of Lower Shuckburgh, Daventry.

Herbert, Rev. James Lloyd, B.A., late Vicar of Llanwrthwl, Breconshire; Rector of Disserth, Radnorshire.

Hobart, Rev. W. H., B.A.; Chaplain of St. Peter's Home and Sisterhood, Kilburn.

James, Rev. Enoch Rhys, B.D., Vicar of Llangollen; Rector of Marchwiel, Wrexham.

Joscelyne, Rev. A. E., B.D., Curate of St. George's-in-the-East; Vicar of St. George's, Millom, Cumberland.

Ketchley, Rev. H. E., B.A., Rector of Barton-le-Street; Surrogate for the Diocese of York.

Lamb, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., Vicar of Clapham-with-Keasden; Rural Dean of Clapham, Yorkshire.

Leeper, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', South Lynn; Rector of Belton, Yarmouth.

Letchworth, Rev. H. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Maidstone; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Kent.

McGill, Rev. J. H. Champion, M.A., Rector of St. Andrew's, Deal; Honorary Secretary of the Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund for the Diocese of Canterbury.

Merryweather, Rev. H. H., M.A., Curate of St. George's, Sheffield; Curate-in-Charge of Tintwistle, Manchester.

Miles, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Battersea; Rector of Catherine Cree-with-St James's, Duke's-place.

Oriel, Rev. Henry Leger, M.A., Vicar of Weybread, Suffolk; Diocesan Inspector for the Deanery of Redenhall (Western Division).

Palmour, Rev. James, B.A., late Rector of Llangwm; Rector of St. Florence's, Pembrokeshire.

Prichard, Rev. Charles Collwyn, M.A., Vicar of Whalley; Rector of Thornton-le-Moors, Chester.

Quine, Rev. John, M.A., Head Master of Douglas Grammar-school; Vicar of Lonan, Isle of Man.

Robertson, Rev. Thomas Boswell, Rector of Kilnasoolagh, Diocese of Killaloe; Incumbent of St. Munchin's, Limerick.

Scott, Rev. J. H., M.A., Rector of Spitalfields; Acting Chaplain to 2nd Tower Hamlets Rifle Volunteers.

Solbé, Rev. C. A., B.A.; Acting Chaplain at the Tower of London.

Sproule, Rev. A. St. Quentin, M.A., late Vicar of Plymstock; Vicar of King's Walden, Herts.

Stanway, Rev. Alfred Henry, A.K.C., Curate of St. Barnabas's, Sutton; Chaplain of the South Metropolitan District Schools, Sutton, Surrey.

Steel, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Harrold, Bedfordshire; Rector of Odell, Bedford.

Stooke-Vaughan, Rev. F. S., M.A., Vicar of Wellington-heath, Ledbury; Honorary Secretary of the Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund for the Diocese of Hereford.

Summers, Rev. Sydney, A.K.C., Curate of Great Berkhamsted; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Potten End, Herts.

Sumner, Rev. S. B, Curate of St. Andrew's, Burnley; Vicar of St. John's, Bolton.

Taylor, Rev. Edward J., F.S.A., Curate of St. Cuthbert's, Durham City; Acting Chaplain to the 4th V.B. Durham Light Infantry.

Thomas, Rev. David James, Curate of Halsall; Vicar of Lydiate, Liverpool.

Towne, Rev. Lyndhurst Burton; Vicar of St. John-the-Baptists, Harlow, Essex.

Tracy, Rev. Augustus Copeland, M.A.; Rector of Gunton, Suffolk.

Tyrwhitt, Rev. the Hon. Leonard Francis, M.A., Curate of Hendon, Middlesex; Vicar of Fenton, Staffordshire.

Van, Rev. H. J. F., M.A., Curate of Sydling, St. Nicholas, Dorset; Rector of Radbourne, Derbyshire.

Vidler, Rev. Arthur Coleman, M.A., Head Master of St. John-at-Hackney Grammar-school; Vicar of Swavesey, St. Ives.

Vincent, Rev. J. R.; Incumbent of St. Bride's, Nether Lochaber.

Welch, Rev. Edward Ashurst, M.A., Vicar of Ven. Bede's, Gateshead; Provost of Trinity College, Toronto.

White, Rev. Frederick George Herbert Henry Eugene, M.A., R.N., Chaplain to the *Grafton*; Chaplain to the *Thunderer*.

Walker, Rev. William, D.D.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.

Waugh, Ven. A. T., M.A., Archdeacon and Canon of Ripon; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Yorkshire (the Hon. H. E. Butler).

Westmacott, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of St. German's, Cornwall; Honorary Secretary of the Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund for the Archdeaconry of Bodmin.

White, Rev. G. C., M.A., Vicar of Newland; Warden of the Diocesan Penitentiary, Malvern.

Wilkinson, Rev. James Blunt, M.A.; Chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, London.

Wilkinson, Rev. James Siely, M.A., Vicar of Kirk Lonan; Vicar of Maughold, Isle of Man.

Williams, Rev. William Henry, B.A., Rector of Langstone; Rector of Kemeys Inferior, Monmouthshire.

Windley, Rev. T. W., M.A., Rector of Thorpe, Derbyshire; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Archdeaconry of Notts.

Winter, Rev. William H., A.B., Recter of Tannagh, Riverstown; Incumbent of St. John's, Coatbridge, Glasgow.

Woosnam, Ven. C. M., M.A., Archdeacon of Macclesfield; Vicar of St. Margaret's, Dunham Massey, Cheshire.

Wright, Rev. Augustus Robert Bingham, M.A., Vicar of Stebbing; Rural Dean of Braintree.

Wright, Rev. F. G, Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Butler, Rev. John, for fifty-eight years Rector of Inkpen, at Inkpen Rectory, on the 19th inst., aged 80.

Dunlap, Rev. Arthur Philip, B.D., for thirty-seven years Rector of Bardwell, Suffolk, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, at Hamilton Lodge, Windsor, on the 19th inst.

Garland, Rev. J., Vicar of Ombersley, and late Rector of Mordiford, at Ombersley Vicarage, on the 16th inst., aged 69.

James, Rev. E. K., forty-five years Rector of the Parish, at Penmaen Rectory, Swansea, on the 19th inst., aged 83.

Jones, Rev. T. D., Vicar, at Caerwent Vicarage, Chepstow, on the 11th inst., aged 70.

Laurie, Rev. James William Borthwick, at Holme Vicarage, Peterborough, on the 17th inst., aged 49.

Sutthery, Rev. William, for thirty-one years Rector of Clifton Reynes, at Chesham, on the 20th inst.

Whitley, Rev. Charles Thomas, D.D., at the Vicarage, Bedlington, on the 22nd inst., aged 87.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SILENCE OF GOD.

By the Ven. F. W. FARRAR. D.D., Archdeacon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, January 6th, 1895.

"The burden of Dumah. He calleth to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night; if ye will enquire, enquire ye; return, come," —Isaiah xxi. 11, 12.

IF you read Isaiah xxi. in our Authorised Version, I fear that, apart from explanation, its meaning will be far from clear. An English critic of eminence has quoted it at length as baffling and obscure. I cannot now pause to show that it is a magnificent specimen of Hebrew poetry in its abrupt energy and passionate intensity, because I wish rather to dwell upon its lessons at this beginning of a new year. The prophet is, or imagines himself to be, in Babylon. Suddenly he sees a storm of invasion sweeping down through the desert, which fills him with alarm. Out of the rolling whirlwind troops of armed warriors flash into distinctness. A splendid banquet is being held in the great Chaldean city; the tables are set, the carpets are spread; they eat, they drink, the revel is at its height. Suddenly a wild cry is heard—"Arise, ye princes, anoint the shield!" in other words, the foe is at hand. "Spring up from the banquet, smear with oil the leathern coverings of your shields, that the blows of the enemy may slide off from them in battle." The clang of arms disturbs the Babylonian feast. The prophet sitting, as it were an illuminated spirit, as a watchman upon the tower, calls aloud to ask the cause of the terror. What is it that the watchman sees? The watchman, with deep, impatient groan, as of a lion, complains that he sees nothing; that he has been set there, apparently for no purpose, all day and all night long. But even as he speaks there suddenly arises an awful need for his look-out. From the land of storm and desolation, the desert between the Persian Gulf and Babylon, he sees a huge and motley host, some mounted on horses, some on asses, some on camels, plunging forward through the night. It is the host of Cyrus on his march against Babylon. In the advent of that Persian host he sees the downfall of the dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar and the liberation of Judah from her exile. On the instant, as though secure of victory, he cries out, "Babylon is fallen!" And he, that is, Cyrus, the Persian king, a monotheist though he be, a worshipper of fire and the sun, has dashed in pieces all the graven images of the city of Nimrod. Then he cries to his fellow-exiles in Babylonian captivity, "O, my people, crushed and trodden down—literally, "O, my grain, and the son of my threshing-floor"—"this is my prophecy for you; it is a prophecy of victory for your champions; it is a prophecy of deliverance for yourselves." Now begins the oracle of Dumah, which forms my text; for now Dumah, the land of Edom, pleads for some vision to her also. Judah is to be rescued. The prophet has seen the Persian host in its varied array—troops of chariots and horsemen crashing through the brazen gates of idolatrous Babylon, extinguishing its feasts in blood, issuing from it with the cry of victory. It is good news for Judah, but what shall it be for Edom? It is as if the voice of Esau cried out once more, "Hast Thou but one blessing, O my Father? Bless me, even me also, O my Father." And as the prophet stands in imagination on the peak of the hill, he hears a voice calling to him out of Seir, the stronghold of the Edomites, a sharp, agitated cry, "Watchman, how far in the night? Watchman, what hour of the night? Does the darkness still linger, is the morning near?" Well might Edom be in terror; the sons of Esau had behaved to Judah in her hour of affliction with malignant hatred which had wounded her to the heart. In Obadiah, in Amos, in Ezekiel, in Jeremiah, you may read traces of their crime. When the Jews fled before the advances of Nebuchadnezzar, the Edomites, true to their miserable destiny—their hand against every man and every man's hand against them—had cruelly massacred and intercepted the helpless fugitives, and had urged Nebuchadnezzar to destroy the Holy City. It is to this that the sad Psalmist of the Exile alludes when he says: "Remember, O Lord, against the children of Edom, in the day of Jerusalem, how they cried, 'Down with it, down with it, even to the ground.'" Naturally, therefore, in the approaching hour of Judah's emancipation, the prophet has not much comfort to bestow on these cruel and treacherous sons of the desert. He calls his response "the burden, or rather the oracle, of Dumah." The word "Dumah" means silence, but it is also, perhaps, a play on the name of Idumea. His answer to Idumea is mainly Dumah, silence, or, as we might represent it in English, "To Edom the oracle is done." All he can say to the Edomite at first is a riddling message of which not much can be made: "The morning came, and also the night cometh: there has been light for some of you, there is darkness for others; I see nothing certain." It is a mingled vision; gleams there have been and glimpses, but after them a funeral pall of blackness rushes down like a storm. It is really a terrible answer, for there can be nothing so terrible for us

on earth as to know that God has nothing to say to us. "O, my God," cried Martin Luther, "smite me with famine, with want, with pestilence, with all the sore diseases on earth, rather than Thou be silent to me." Yet God is sometimes thus silent to wicked men and to wicked nations; He is so for their punishment. "Ephraim is turned unto idols. Let him alone. Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded: but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh."

But then, after this stern and dubious answer, as though somewhat relenting, the watchman cries, "If ye wish to enquire again, enquire ye," and then, very briefly, "Return, come." In other words, "The oracle for you, sons of Edom, is no vaticination about a mere earthly future." It may be summed up in two words—in the warning, "Repent," and in the invitation, "Come."

But now, my friends, leaving behind Edom and the Persian host, and the watchman prophet on his watch-tower, let us see whether in his brief and riddling answer there are any lessons for ourselves. Before us, too, as before Edom, looms, and perhaps even lowers at this moment, the phantom of the unknown. Before us, before the eyes of every one of us, hangs the cloud-curtain of the future, with all its chance and change, with all its light and darkness, with all its joys and sorrows, with all its hopes and fears, with all its perils and possibilities of life and death; and through that clouded curtain there sometimes seems to flash gleams of menace. Upon us also, upon our individual lives, come plunging forward, like a motley host through the night and desert of the unknown, forms which may prove to be the enemies of our life, the forces of nature, the laws of circumstance, the destinies of heaven, the retribution of sin, the heirs and avengers of the unrelenting past. Will there be for us also, in that lingering or careering host, any of the blessings of faithfulness, to induce any of the angels of mercy to intercede? Who, if he yielded to natural curiosity, would not desire to know something about the coming years—if for us there be any coming years—and what they shall bring? Unseen on his mountain watch-tower stands the silent angel of our future, and sometimes we can hardly help crying to him, "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, how far in the night? What lies hidden for us in that world of darkness? Is it defeat or is it victory? Is it brighter hopes or is it deepening despondency? Is it true repentance or is it the retributive fall into yet deeper sins? Is it a preluding to heaven or is it a foretaste of hell?" We cry, and what answer comes? None as regards all earthly fortunes; only an oracle of Dumah—that is, of silence. That future does not belong to any one of us; it may not be ours at all. It is God's. Its margin fades, and will for ever fade before us as we move. It is in His mercy no less than in His wisdom that God has wrapt the issues of the future in deepest gloom. We must walk by faith in these matters, for we cannot walk by sight. We should only be puffed up by foreseen successes; we should only be paralysed by anticipated anguish. All that the oracle of Dumah can cry to us is, Alas, alas—

> Whatever hath been written shall remain,
> Nor be erased, nor written o'er again;
> The unwritten only still remains to be,
> Take heed and ponder well what that shall be.

But next let us observe that the oracle is not all dark, there is a flash of light through the darkness. "The morning comes," cries the watchman, the morning, the grey dawn, if not the auroral flush. If we are sometimes flattered and cajoled by our hopes of the future, we are far more often the fools of a faithless despair. "The misfortunes of misfortunes," says the French proverb, "are those that never happen." Life is often terrified by unsubstantial shadows or by the dread of events which either do not happen, or if they do, we find them, by God's grace, to be bearable. It is an utter mistake to let melancholy jangle into discord the music of our lives, when there is for every one of us, or may be, a hope, not earthly indeed, but heavenly, which smiles enchanted over the chords and waves her golden hair. The morning cometh for all of us, even if there be night as well. How far, far better has God been to every one of us than we feared! How infinitely more kind and compassionate to us than any one of us has deserved!

> I said, The darkness must content my soul.
> God said, Let there be light;
> I said, The night must see me reach my goal—
> Instead came dawning bright.
>
> I bared my head to meet the smiter's stroke—
> There came sweet dropping oil.
> I waited trembling, but the voice that spoke,
> Said gently, Cease thy toil.
>
> I looked for evil—stern of face and pale,
> Came good too fair to tell.
> I leant on God when other joys did fail—
> He gave me these as well.

But again the morning cometh, and also the night—is it not quite literally true for all of us? Of what will our future years be composed? Will they not consist of days for mortal toil and of nights for quiet slumber? Our life is but an inn whose doorways are day and night. The present only is ours; we need not think much nor too sadly of the unborn to-morrows or of the dead yesterdays. The past can never be altered, and to-morrow we may be ourselves with the millenniums of those dead yesterdays. What we have to do, what alone we have to do, is to make to-day good. To-day is ours; it may be happy or unhappy, in the earthly sense, exactly as it shall please God, and perhaps it does not greatly matter which;

but in any case it can be good, and if it be good, then it *must*, it *will* be blessed and fruitful. Let us think of this life as a corn-field through which we are passing. If we linger, a heavy hand is laid upon our shoulders, which hurries us along, but we have at least time to pluck a few ears of corn, and to rub them in the palms of our hands, and if we do this, it shall be well with us; but if, attracted by the flaunting of some scarlet poppy, we shall leave the straight path and trample down the wheat, we may, indeed, pluck the red poppy to find its leaves flaccid and shrivelled, and be sickened by its acrid odour, and to find its clammy poison blister and stain our hands. But oh, young man or woman, be sure that for every poppy of evil passion which you pluck you must and will bear the blister, the stain, and the shame, and that for every sheaf of duty or opportunity that you tread under foot you shall have so much wheat the less in the eventual harvest; but go straightforward day by day and it shall be well with you—well however ill it may look or even for the moment seem. "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, how far in the night will the deepening gloom of life, as it advances, bring us sorrow, disappointment, failure, weariness, sickness, pain?" And the oracle to him answers, "If it does, my son, it will bring you each of these only one day at a time, and therefore strength to bear them." There, after all, it will bring the Divine. the golden opportunities of everlasting life. "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof; sufficient for each day its glory and its blessing too."

But again, unsatisfied, we cry out of our wilderness, "Watchman, what of the night?" And again the voice has, and can have, no answer for us than this—"The morning cometh, also the night." And yet we need not be afraid, It is morning now, or has been; it will be night soon. "I must," said our blessed Lord, "do the works of Him that sent Me while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work." That day is life; that night is death.

> What is our little life?
> A peevish April day,
> A little sun, a little rain,
> And then night sweeps along the plain,
> And takes our hopes away.

The ancient philosophers and the mediæval saints often said that life should be a contemplation of death. At the old Roman and Egyptian feasts a little ivory skeleton was handed round among the revellers, and the skull of the monk or hermit was to them a continual reminder of the fading of the glory into darkness, and of all life unto dust. We have little need of skull or skeleton to remind us. Into the dull air the death-bell tolls; under our feet the earth is opened into graves. We have vanished faces in our hearts; in our homes we have vacant chairs; in our memories we have voices that nothing on earth can fill. If we did but bear in mind how short is life, how little provision we require for this brief pilgrimage, how soon all earthly things shall fade as the flower fadeth. we might then be led to look upwards more. It is morning now; but will you care only for the mirage which glitters for the moment on the sands of the scorching wilderness through which you are passing, and not for the goal towards which you are toiling?

> One moment of the cup of life to taste,
> One moment in annihilation's waste,
> O, make haste, make haste.

Aye, we all make haste to gratify our earthly desires, but do not many of us live as if there were no such thing as the Unseen Eternal? What are you living for? To reach this or that position, to gratify this or that passion, to make so much money and then retire, to start your children in life. Ah, me! thou art very careful, and troublest about many things; but the one thing needful—has that been thought of? "The morning cometh, and also the night." Yes, my brethren, there are no fields of armaranth on this side of the grave. The night of death awaits us all, and if we are expecting that icy death of death, caring no longer for anything that life has to give, longing only to be released, soon to be stretched out cold and dead, not even feeling the hot tear of our loved ones upon our cheek, how then will this life shrivel into insignificance—all our little desires, our little ambitions, our little enmities, the burning passions which have burnt themselves out, the fierce animosities about the infinitely little, the pleasures which, long ere that time, will have sickened into chillness and corruption! O, Death, eloquent, just and mighty Death, thou art the great leveller! It is morning now, and, as the prophet describes to us, in this garish daylight we see the fly creeping on the leaf, we see the blue sky, we see the sun with its orb of flame, and it all seems very vast; but the morning fades into the darkness. No sooner is it dark than, O Heavens! what a spectacle is before us in that midnight with all its stars! The sun has disappeared, and has, indeed, dwindled into insignificance. We can no longer see leaf or insect; but lo! instead of one sun you see myriads of suns, galaxies of suns, star dust of suns in the wide abyss of unnumbered systems, a gorgeous and boundless universe of heavens beyond heavens, rivers and seas of stars in which each is a sun in that illimitable firmament, blaze within blaze, unimagined depth and harmony of planets, huge suns and moons, wheel within wheel, arching the one sapphire. The poor daylight of earth you see hides infinitely more than it reveals. It reveals to us an atom, it hides from us a universe; it reveals little things, it hides infinitude. May not death do the same? Why do we, then, shun death with anxious strife? If life can thus deceive, wherefore not death? Yes, when the wheels of life's battle's caravanserai crumble into dust, we shall step per-

force from under the mud roof of the temporal into the large air of the eternal And then how will man's little opinions and desires, our aims, our party intrigues, our political combinations, our religious jealousies—how will all the shadows, the dust of the ashes upon which we may have wasted our lives and shipwrecked our souls, look then? How will the whole world become to us but a bubble whose colours in a moment break and fly! How will it vanish and evaporate, like a snowflake, when the night cometh, and in one moment we must all appear before the God of gods!

Lastly, we may all lead a life, we may, by God's grace, this very day, this very hour, begin such a life. The morning, indeed, will come to us, but no real night, for in the City of God we are told that there is no night there, and of that high city we are all called to be citizens. So it may be, but also it may be otherwise. There is for some human souls, and there may be for us, by our own fatal choice, only night—all night, no morning, the twilight, the evening, the black, dark night. Repentant Peter, weeping bitterly, rushes out into the night, but it was to meet the morning dawn! But Judas—and he, too, had been an Apostle—left his brethren, left his Lord, and went forth to sell his Lord and his own soul for thirty pieces of silver. He went out, and it was night, night, night! Was it not a night on which for him in this world no morning dawned? Of this awful alternative I will not speak; but if there be any one of you who needs such a warning, think of it, for such things have been and may be—aye, and are. But far more let ours be the life which He who is the Light of the World has lightened; such a life may be ours. Our lot is not decided by destiny, or by chance, or by time. Time is nothing, time is no agent; destiny is only the will of God; chance is the nickname we give to God's providence. Life is no chess-board of dawn and darkness on which fate plays with us, pushing us hither and thither, until at last it takes us one by one, and flings the kings and the pawns into the common bag. Not so, we are our own fate. We decide the colour of our own lives:

> Our acts will follow us from afar,
> And what we have been makes us what we are.

We need no oracle, whether of Dumah or otherwise, save such as may be given in awful voices from the prophetic caverns of our own memories. We need no horoscopes of material stars; man is his own star and the soul that can render an honest and a perfect man—

> Commands all light, all influence, all fate;
> Nothing to him falls early or too late.
> Our acts are angels of our good or ill,
> Are fatal shadows that walk by us still.

And then to each of us the oracle of the future ends, as the oracle of Dumah ends, "Return, come." Do not let your life be determined by its past, if that has been evil. Break up your fallow ground, and sow not among its thorns. If your past has been a bad past, turn your back upon it, break with it. So did David, so did Manasseh, so did Paul, so did Augustine, so did the Prodigal, so did the Magdalene, and why may not you? Watchman, what of the night? We ask it for our country upon the splendid memorials of the olden world, in their godlessness, their corruptions, and their decrepitude. Out of the Teutonic forests thundered Goth and Vandal and Hun, and the Romans went down before them; upon their imperial oppression burst the overlying doom. Are there no hostile forces generated by greed, and infidelity, and cynicism, and hate, and lies, which may be nursing for us in England an impatient earthquake among the huge masses of our population—among the pauperised and unemployed, the ignorant and vicious, the idle and criminal classes? Unless we be wise and self-denying may we not see the sources of peril which may hereafter shatter to pieces the institutions of England, and once more dip her flag in the blood of civil war—the pain of multitudes steeped in miseries in the slums and rookeries of our overgrown cities, the pride and greed and avarice of a few steeped to the lips in sensuality and luxury, whose voices are roused to fury at any attempt to check their career of money getting or drunken indulgence, or of immoral excitement, or gross, shameless, unblushing impurity? Watchman, what of the night? The oracle is an oracle of silence, for it depends on conditions; but the dark curtain of the future, so impenetrable to sight, is translucent to faith, and it utters an eternal law: One thing, and one thing only, exalteth a nation, and that is righteousness; and one thing, and one thing only, is the destruction of any people, and that is wrong, robbery, impurity, and sin.

And for ourselves, what need we of oracles? Our future will be in all essential things exactly as we make it. The sunshine or the shadow of our lives is less in our surroundings than ourselves. The oracle of God to man is not silence. St. Paul gave it long ago: "God will render to every man according to his works; to them that, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honour and incorruption He will give eternal life, but unto them that are factious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation, wrath, tribulation, and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil." Be not you of those. If you have been of them, if you still are of them, "Return, come." Return ere it be too late; come while the voice of your Saviour still pleads with you from His epiphany to His crucifixion. Then the oracle of the future, in spite of all that the world or man can do to you, in spite of all the malice or subtlety of Satan or man, that oracle shall always still be to you an oracle of illimitable hope, not only for this new year, but to the end of time it will be, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's

good pleasure to give you the kingdom." It will be—

Put thou thy trust in God;
In Duty's path go on;
Walk in His strength, in Faith and Hope,
So shall thy work be done.

Through waves and clouds and storms
His power will cleave the way.
Wait thou His time, the darkest night
Shall end in glorious day.

CONVERSION.

By the Rev. GEORGE W. GENT, M.A., Principal of St. Mark's College, Chelsea.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on March 31st, the Fifth Sunday in Lent, 1895.

"No man can come unto Me except the Father Which hath sent Me draw him."—St. John vi. 44.

THERE is probably no subject about which an ordinary man in this country, one I mean well inclined on the whole towards religion, feels so much difficulty as about the widely preached doctrine of conversion. In a general way he is quite ready to acknowledge the need for it; he is well aware that he has himself but ill-responded to the gift he received in baptism, and admits that for him, as for so many, the question of questions is, whether he has or has not turned his back upon evil, and is or is not walking with his face set toward the city of God. But he is startled and perplexed at hearing so much in regard to this same "conversion" which has little or no actuality or meaning so far as his own experience has gone. He is told that he ought to be able to name the exact date, nay, the very day and hour at which he sensibly or consciously underwent the process of conversion; and he cannot do so. It is urgently pressed upon him that at and after conversion he became or should have become a changed creature, a creature to whom his old temptations and old weaknesses were as if they had never been, a creature upon whom there had descended an instantaneous and complete power of conforming himself to the pattern of Christ, and walking after the commandments of God. To be converted, he is confidently assured, is to pass at once from a condition of sin and spiritual exile to a state not merely of grace, but of absolute saintliness and perfected communion with God. And the man perplexed and perhaps repelled, because he feels that all this is so painfully untrue of himself. He is striving, it may be, to shake off the chains of sin, and to give himself to God. But the old temptations, though weakening, are still with him; the old struggle, though lessening, is still there; he knows nothing of any instantaneous crisis at which, having been up to that moment a sinner, he becomes at once and for all future time a saint.

It is worth our while on this Sunday morning in Lent to look a little closely at this popular doctrine of conversion, and ask ourselves what the Church to which we belong has to say to it. Where did it come from, and what are its main characteristics?

So far as we English-speaking races are concerned, it took shape first with John Wesley, and John Wesley derived it from his Moravian friends. Wesley, as we all know, was a Churchman, and a believer, all his life, in sacramental means of grace. How or why at a particular moment in his career he came to super-impose upon the Church's system, which he had been preaching with so much success for so many years, the Moravian doctrine of conversion is a problem of which I shall not attempt the solution this morning. That he did do so is quite certain both from the correspondence of William Law with him upon the point, and from his own strange declaration, made five days after his "conversion," that "till within the last five days I have never been a Christian." In connection with the matter there are but two points which now need notice. In the first place, Wesley himself would seem during the rest of his life to have receded in a considerable degree from the more extreme views concerning conversion. At all events he separated himself from the Moravians, and condemned those who neglected or underrated the sacraments as means of grace. But, in the second place, quite the reverse is true of the followers he left behind him. With them conversion became not merely an additional outwork of their system, but the foundation and base of it all. Any one who has mixed much with the Methodists in Cornwall or in Wales will know this. Separated as they are upon many points, they are all at one in regarding "conversion" as the supreme crisis of the spiritual life. It is a crisis which in their view must take place in the life of every elect Christian; until it occurs there is little in the spiritual or moral life of the individual that can count for much in the way of salvation, and when it has happened he has nothing more to fear.

We should, however, form a very incorrect estimate of the widespread influence of this doctrine if we regarded it as confined or mainly confined to the members of the various Wesleyan bodies. The influence of John Wesley, great within his own circle, was almost as great upon the outside communities of Christians which in England surrounded him. It cannot too often be repeated that during the first part of the eighteenth century the great Nonconformist "causes" of the preceding century—that is to say, the Independents and the Baptists—were to all appearance dying out in England; and the same statement, be it remembered at this moment, was true of Nonconformity in Wales. Upon these dry bones the preaching of Wesley and his followers fell as a

quickening breath. The Calvinistic doctrines of election and reprobation woke again at the touch of a doctrine so easily identified with them as the Wesleyan doctrine of conversion. The Church of England herself—a section of which had always leaned to Calvinism—was mightily affected by the new movement. In our own day the Church has been to a great extent transformed by another and later movement; but upon the Nonconformist bodies the effect of the Wesleyan movement has been permanent It has really had the result, in spite of their external disunion, of solidifying them into a tolerably homogeneous whole. They are one doctrinally—and that, I suppose, is why "undenominationalism" seems so natural to them—because they all alike make the spiritual life of the individual Christian begin and end in some crisis of election or conversion. That fact is, indeed, the real ground, and the necessary ground, of their disagreement with the sacramental system of the Church.

It is right that I should make it quite clear, at this point in my sermon, what I mean. I am speaking of that doctrine of conversion or election which lays it down that such conversion must take place in the case of all men who are really Christans; that, if converted at all, they must be able to assign the exact date at which the crisis occurred; that a conscious, instantaneous, and finally complete spiritual change must then have occurred to them; that they have passed immediately from a state of sin to a state of entire Christian enlightenment and perfection. I am speaking of that doctrine which, though it has always been a stumbling-block to the more educated, has impressed itself with wonderful permanence upon the popular imagination and the popular heart, both in this country and in the United States of America. Nay, so much has this been the case that to a great many people, educated and uneducated, Christian and non-Christian, to be religious means to have gone through some such crisis as this doctrine of conversion supposes; instead of saying of a man that "he is religious," it is commonly said in America, and it is occasionally said in this country, that he has "got religion." And it is because I know that so many good people identify Christianity with this doctrine, and are perplexed by it, and repelled from Christianity by it, just for the reason that they cannot make it square with their own moral and spiritual experience, that I ask now how far it is true, and what, in short, the Church to which we belong has to say about the whole matter.

Let me premise that I do not propose to embarrass the discussion at this point by a consideration of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. That is a very important doctrine, both from a theological and from a practical point of view, and one that cannot be long ignored in any complete discussion of those views of conversion which I have outlined. But, for my present purpose, I may leave it on one side, and admit that, however it may happen, the great majority of men do lapse into sin, and require to be "converted" or "turned back" to God, before they can be considered to be in the way of salvation. In such cases the Church has no more doubt than have the Wesleyans of the supreme necessity of conversion, of the eternal importance to every such soul of the question, "Can I or can I not make a break with the past, and turn back to the service of God?" We Churchmen do not deny, and God forbid that we should deny, the stupendous fact that sinners are so converted, that their conversion is an immense reality to them, that it marks in the case at least of those who persevere unto the end, the great crisis of their lives. In no case, whatever we may have to say in criticism of the doctrine of conversion as it is held by some, let us throw doubt upon the Divine fact, the supreme reality of conversion itself.

It is when this undoubted fact in the life of some men is hardened into a dogma, and treated as a necessary experience in the religious life of all men, that the Church begins to remonstrate. There have been pious souls, she will maintain, who, from their baptism to their deathbed Communion, from the cradle to the grave, have listened to the call of God, have used the means of grace, have persevered in the Christian life until the end. If it be answered, as it sometimes is, that this is a special case of conversion, then the Church has still much to say on conversion as it is usually understood by those who have gone forth from her fold. It is a mistake, she will say again, to think that conversion necessarily involves a datable moment at which the change takes place; a still greater mistake to hold that at the moment of conversion the soul passes at once from the depths of sin to the heights of saintliness. It may and does happen, in many cases, that there is a sudden and therefore a datable change, such as it so much delights so many religious persons to witness; but it may also happen, and this happens in many cases too, that the process is gradual and almost unperceived, so that the man finds himself serving God as he never served Him before, without being able to say when the change took place exactly, or even to say whether any violent change took place at all. But, in any case, and however the change—if there was a change—be conceived to have taken place, the Church will still protest with all her might against the view that any man is ever completely converted in a moment—evelifted, as I have said, at once from the depths of sin to the height of saintliness. After conversion as before, she will maintain, there will still be temptation, and there will still be struggle; there will still be need for use of the ordinary means of grace there must still be prayer, perhaps more than ever before, for the special grace of perseverance. And the voice

of the Church will grow stern indeed if there shall reach her ear any whisper of those terrible, though logical, consequences which have been deduced from perverted doctrines of conversion. Woe betide those, she will say, who allow themselves to think that it does not matter what they do—that they are only "baking bricks in Egypt"—until the moment of their conversion comes, or suppose that when once they are converted they cannot, however they may occasionally fall into sin, yet fall irrevocably away from God. Converted or unconverted she will proclaim, as she has proclaimed to all the ages, sin is always sin; the moment you sin, though you may have been of the called, you cease to be of the chosen of God—you cut yourself off from Him; the saint who has sinned can but get hardly back, like the habitual sinner, by the old and only way of contrition and repentance. "I keep my body under and bring it into subjection, lest by any means, after I have preached to others, I myself may be a castaway."

It is ill work criticising the religious views of others, if we are not prepared to state our own. Let us try to put into words what the Church holds positively about conversion.

The two great mistakes are surely to say that God calls only certain special persons, and that He calls them once for all. The truth is that God calls, or, as my text has it, "draws," all men without exception, and that He calls them, both those who respond and those who do not respond, over and over again. There is none of you here that has not been called; there is no one of you that, even if he has turned toward God in answer to the call, has not been called to further and greater heights. There are those, I am told, among this congregation this morning, who have just been confirmed as boys at school, and who are about to make, or have but lately made, their first Communion. Let me use them as a type and example of what I mean. My younger brethren, God called you at your baptism, and it is to be supposed that you have responded to that call. Your reward is that God calls you again in confirmation, that He offers you a great spiritual opportunity when, by the gate of confirmation, you are admitted to the supreme means of grace, that upon your response to these calls and to this opportunity He will surely vouchsafe to you, in His providence, further calls to His service, and new opportunities of grace and strengthening. And what is true of you is true of us all. Those whom I have been criticising often speak as if there was, as it were, a straight line drawn, to stay on one side of which was to be lost; to cross which was to pass at once and for ever into the flock of the Redeemed. To my thought no metaphor could be more misleading. God is calling all of us, and every individual of us is in some different attitude toward God. Some are marching away from Him, and to them the call is to turn back, and retrace at whatever cost their wandering footsteps. Some have turned back, and the path, perhaps, has become comparatively easy to them; God calls them again to a higher place and a harder struggle. Over and over again the reward of obedience to one call is that another comes higher, and perhaps more difficult still. And my point is that what we curselves are responsible for is the answer which each one of us makes to his own call. He is in danger of condemnation who is called to turn back, and does not turn back; but he is in danger also who, having turned back to God, having been "converted," is called forward, and yet forward, and allows himself somewhere or other to stand still. There is no fixed line to cross which is to be "saved;" the forward call is continuous, and it is not for any of us to say presumptuously at any given point that the struggle is over, and that we are "safe." For us the only "safety" is to respond continuously to the continuous calls of God, in the strength that has been won for us by Christ, and that is given to us, as we need it, in the means of grace which He ordained.

Think, my brethren, for a moment of the noble view of religion and of Christianity that is thus opened out before us. Our religion, our close hold upon the Person and Work of our Redeemer, it is no longer a desire merely to escape the punishment of our sins, merely to be able to assure ourselves that we are "safe." It is the desire everywhere and at all times to respond to the calls of God, and to conform ourselves by the leading of the Holy Spirit to the Pattern of the Son Who is Himself the Image of the Father. To think of our religion in this way is to make it, as great saints have made it, a daily discipline, a life-long communion with God, a satisfaction of the highest and noblest instincts of our humanity. It is to fashion ourselves not after the fashion of this world, but to be "transformed by the renewing of our mind, that we may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

WE are glad to know that the new Member for Mid-Norfolk, Mr. R. T. Gurdon, is an excellent Churchman. He is, for one thing, an active and constant attendant at the meetings of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences.

THE Church Pastoral Aid Volunteers (in connection with the C.P.A.S.) which has recently sprung into existence, is, we are told, gradually gaining sympathy and support. Its objects are twofold:—First, to unite for prayer and mutual help all those engaged in the Home Mission work of the Church of England and in sympathy with the C.P.A.S.; and, secondly, to provide a register of such of the members as are able and willing to give addresses. The syllabus of the present session's monthly meetings at 32, Fleet Street, includes such well-known names as the Rev. A. S. Barnes-Lawrence, J. F. Kitto, Arthur J. Robinson, Rev. E. C. Unmack, etc.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1895.

PEW RENTS.

IT is certainly most remarkable that the London Diocesan Conference should have decided by a large majority in favour of pew rents. Many of us have long looked upon the pew system as doomed, because hopelessly out of fashion. And, indeed, there were many sound reasons for discarding a custom which seemed to make a recognised right to a seat in church the privilege of the moneyed householder. And yet it turns out that the old system retains its hold upon some at least of its devotees, and is even gaining favour. There are grounds for it.

First, pew rents are not exorbitant. The rent asked for accommodation for a year for a whole family is probably not one-fourth of the amount of the doctor's bill, perhaps not much more than the tobacconist's. It cannot be regarded as a hardship if the head of the house be asked to pay but little more for the Sunday services for his whole family than for his week day pipe. On these terms none but the very poorest should be unable to afford a seat in church, and their needs are not likely to be neglected, for there is scarcely such a thing as an absolutely unfree church. There are always enough free seats to accommodate those who are entirely unable to pay. And there are distinct advantages in always having a settled place in church. It is good for families to be able to sit together, it is very good to know where you are going to sit, to be sure that there will be accommodation, to have a place to leave your books, a secure corner for your hat, and so forth. On the other hand it is not good to have to hurry to church long before the time, to push and scramble for admission, to break up your party, and after many a struggle and push, and all the common and profane incidentals of a shoving crowd, to find a seat at last, long after service has begun, hot and flustered, with thoughts all scattered and disordered and by no means such as are fitting the occasion and the place. With an entirely free church one never knows when this sort of thing is going to happen. For weeks the accommodation may be all that can be desired, and then suddenly may come an influx of visitors, or a popular preacher, and regular attendants may find it imposible to get a seat. Fixity of tenure, undisturbed occupation, and freedom from personal discomfort and inconvenience, are valuable accessories of public worship, and there is no reason why we should not have them, where it can be done without injuring other people. Proper provision for the poor always ought to be made, but there is no justice in the poor man claiming the whole church and denying his fellows.

There is another reason for pew-rents, and that is that they are a valuable means of supporting the church and keeping together the congregation. They mean regular worshippers and a regular sustentation fund. The conscience of visitors at church is very elastic in the matter of offerings, and the sums contributed to the alms-bag, even in free and open churches, are too often painfully small. In wealthy town parishes the case may be different, but even where large offerings are the rule it will generally be found that the total is disproportionately swelled by individual gifts. And it should not be forgotten that collections are now the rule in pew-rented churches, and in very many such churches the voluntary offerings are quite equal to the amount of pew rents. It is by no means likely that, if the pew rents were cut off, the deficiency would be met by increased offerings. It might be in some cases, but the affair would be left to the individual conscience, and the conscience of many individuals is quite equal to the dishonourable proceeding of enjoying church services gratis. People are already far too unwilling to acknowledge the claims of the clergy to any remuneration, even the most inadequate, and the complete adoption of the voluntary principle would probably mean that the bulk of the expenses of divine worship would be borne by the generous few, while a great many would quietly pocket the remitted pew-rent without increasing their contribution to the offertory, which often remains the only way of contributing to the support of the church. For the number of churches in large towns, where alone pew-rents obtain to any extent, has caused the practical merging of the parish boundaries. People constantly attend churches, for divers reasons, which are not their parish churches, and run the risk, in consequence, of missing the ministrations of their own clergy; for the staff of clergy in a parish is not, as a rule,

able to deal with the population without any reference to their attendance at church. While contributing little or nothing to the support of their own parish church, these roamers pay nothing to any other, and often rove from church to church, according to the weather, the nature of the service, the style of the preacher, and what not. The possession of a fixed point somewhere might be in many ways advantageous to them.

The line taken by the London Diocesan Conference seems to indicate that these ideas are gaining ground, and that, after a long period of criticism and unpopularity, the pew-rent principle, wisely and liberally applied, is likely to be recognised as a sound method of connecting the congregation with the clergy and the church.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE Bishop's address at the London Diocesan Conference last week was an hour long, but was listened to with unflagging attention. Dr. Temple spoke with great earnestness upon the importance of maintaining Church schools, observing that little could be done in the way of influencing Board schools in favour of religious education. He defended, at great length, the proposal of the Archbishop's Committee not to ask for aid from the rates, but to endeavour to obtain the payment of teachers from Imperial funds. He was emphatic in his assertion that the managers of Church schools must keep the appointment of teachers in their own hands, and the meeting warmly cheered him, but the Bishop did not really face the argument, which to many appears fatal to the proposal, that if the Education Department pays the teaching staff, it will be sure to claim a voice in appointments and dismissals.

The debate which called forth the greatest interest was on Mr. St. Hill Bourne's motion in defence of pew-rents, as against the system of free and open churches. Only one thing was wanting to make it exciting, and that was a thorough-going defence of what Mr. Coxhead called the fad of free and open churches. The only defence which was forthcoming was contributed by the secretary of the society which endeavours to abolish pew-rents, and an Islington clergyman, who strongly protested his hatred of them. Several speakers expressed a strong conviction that the prevalent neglect of church-going by the younger generation is due in great degree to the virtual abolition of the old family pew. The Conference had dwindled very much before the division was taken, but the numbers left no doubt as to the prevalent feeling. The maintenance of pew-rents was voted by 43 to 18.

The feeling of the Conference was evidently strong in support of the Archbishop's Patronage Bill, Mr. Barlow failing to carry his proposal for amending it, though the amendments suggested were by no means drastic. The meeting seemed not in any degree to share the fear of the vicar of Islington that the Bill may open the door to episcopal injustice. The Bishop, who had spoken on the subject in his opening address, as well as on Disestablishment, thought Mr. Barlow's fear exaggerated, but promised to consider the Bill very carefully in committee.

A pleasant feature of the Conference was the unusually hearty welcome accorded to the new East-end Assistant Bishop, Dr. Browne, who was consecrated Bishop of Stepney last Sunday week. His name was received with a burst of cheering which showed how popular is the appointment. The Bishop spoke a few words in seconding a motion by Lord Wolmer on the scheme of systematic Church Defence set on foot by the Primate, but made no reference to his new work.

This may be a convenient place to note that the second name which was sent up to the Queen for the appointment of a successor to Bishop Billing was that of the Rev. C. H. Turner, Rector of St. George's-in-the-East. If the selection had lain with the East-end clergy, Mr. Turner would doubtless have had the office, but they do not know Dr. Browne as Bishop Temple knows him.

The warmest expression in the Church papers of satisfaction at Archdeacon Farrar's appointment to the Deanery of Canterbury comes, rather surprisingly, from the *Record*, which thinks that it will be approved by Evangelical Churchmen; while "among the people at large no appointment could have been more popular." The *Church Times* doubts whether Dr. Farrar is qualified by taste or sympathy to improve the ritual or worship of his cathedral. But it thinks that possibly his promotion to a responsible office will have the beneficial effect of tempering to some extent the dogmatism of his public utterances.

The Pope's Letter to the English people has been received by recognised exponents of religious opinion in a very different spirit from that which would have greeted such a document in former times. It may be said, no doubt, that the "separated brethren" have never before been addressed by a Bishop of Rome in similar terms. The piety and good feeling which dictated the letter are acknowledged on all hands, and, even in quarters where it was, perhaps, hardly to be expected, some degree of sympathy with the Pope's desire for reunion is apparent.

The *Guardian*, which rather incautiously calls the manifesto "the Apostolic Letter," thinks its publication warrants us in believing that the present occasion is a favourable one for letting the authorities at Rome understand—not through the intervention of English Roman Catholics, but directly from ourselves, and in the Latin tongue—what the English Church really claims, and on what grounds. The *Church Times* says that the letter "lifts the whole question of reunion on to a higher level, places it in an atmosphere outside all human passion and prejudice, appeals to motives common to all who call on the name of Christ our God, and compels them to approach it in the light of our Lord's love, and of all He has done to redeem their souls, and make the whole family of men one in Him."

The *Record*, speaking as a moderate Evangelical organ, sees a common significance in the Pope's Letter and in the Grindelwald Conferences, though "the combination of holiday-making with serious effort" in the latter has perhaps prevented their real motive from being adequately understood. "Let us not," it says, "underrate that significance. It looks as if the Great Disposer of human hearts were turning them in different sects and churches towards one another. If so, we may well wait in thankful confidence that the same Almighty power which has begun a good work will find a way for its accomplishment." The *English Churchman* is irre-

concilable. It recognises in the Pope's Letter "the voice of the stranger," the blandishments of "the strange woman," and the utterances of the Anti-Christian spirit. The readers of the paper are warned that "they should at once and for ever renounce all sympathy with the idea of united Christendom, as impossible to be realised except at the cost of Christ and His Gospel."

The Dean-designate of Canterbury and Archdeacon Sinclair have been interviewed on the subject of the Pope's appeal. "Let me say at the outset," said Dr. Farrar, "that I have the greatest possible respect for the Pope personally, as, in fact, all must have, for his dignity, piety, and kindliness. But as touching re-union, his letter will have no effect whatever on the mass of English Churchmen." Archdeacon Sinclair says the letter shows the Pope to be a very amiable and kind-hearted man, and a very good Christian, but he abates none of the claims that have led to division; and "nobody, except dreamers like Lord Halifax," believes re-union to be possible.

Diocesan lay readers are approved by the Bishop of Liverpool, as well as by the Bishop of London Dr. Ryle commissioned eleven gentlemen to this function at a special service in his pro-cathedral on Tuesday week.

A good story is told in the *Record* of a lady and her observant little son, who were present at an Easter service when the offertory was for the vicar. After the service was over the lady was in deep conversation with a number of the leading members of the congregation, when one of them asked her, "Well, what did you think of the sermon?" "I thought it was poor, very poor." Then the little boy chimed in, "But oh! mother, what could you expect for a ha'penny?"

THE HIGHER ASCENT OF MAN.

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., stated:—

Sir David Brewster, great in science, thanked God that the way of salvation is so simple; no hard argument, no puzzling out of difficulty is required; to believe in the Lord Jesus is to live. These were his last words: "Life has been very bright to me, and now there is the brightness beyond." The present life is of great value. In the right use of it we are being led on to the attainment of a monarch mind, to the faculty of commanding circumstances, to the mystery of God-like power. At the end and after our present life recollection will bring beautiful visions of the past, and their excellent meanings will be fully known. We may be said to know this, for our acquaintance with the world shows that the vast universal harmony includes the lowest and meanest under the sun. Everything with which we have to do is infinitely grander in its meaning and results than all we know, or are at present able to know. We are even now at a height far beyond the imagination of an uncultured mind, and are not yet at the close of our day. We discern a pathway of gold to that embodied glory the sun in heaven, which sets but to rise in other lands, to make them also fair in the beauty of light. We, too, are advancing and widening, not to return hither again, but, as men accompanying that sun in his vastly grander motion, to pass onward and onward to an ascent vast beyond all our ken.

Regarding our advance in knowledge of creation, and our spiritual insight as to the meaning and future of things in that knowledge of material workmanship, and in that spirit by which we are able to be in the presence of the Great Father, we are finite representatives of the things made, and of the Power making and ruling them. We bear the image of the earthly, and we bear the image of the heavenly. Take Adam as a man and first example of the life we live, you are soon by devout thought in Paradise. Then Eve, as representing love, and desire for higher knowledge and higher state, leads to Christ born of woman, as woman was born of man. In the pathway to this, and nearer to what we are now, we learn the mystery of life and knowledge. From this standing we see that the physical and moral evil is removing the unfit, the incapable, and prepares the seekers of what is true and good within the attainment of every man, for that higher ascent which we discern as extending from the earthly horizon to things of surpassing beauty. It becomes every one of us to say, as we look, day by day, at our work, "God forgive me that I have done it no better. God help me to surpass myself in the future, that, attaining the higher ascent, I may be welcomed in the new country and crowned as victor."

"God Living in the World" will be next week's subject.

HIGHER SCIENCE LECTURES.—The Rev. Prebendary Reynolds will give a course of Higher Science Lectures in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C. (near the General Post Office), during May, on Wednesdays at 1.15 p.m:—May 1. "God Living in the World." May 8. "Things in General." May 15. "Some Things in Particular." May 22. "What is Life?" May 29. "What is Death?" The lectures last no more than half an hour, and are intended for the strengthening of weak faith and the confirmation of strong faith.

NOTES OF A NEW YEAR'S SERMON.

BY THE REV. B. MATURIN, M.A., VICAR OF LYMINGTON, AND RURAL DEAN OF LYNDHURST.

MOSES LEADING AND PLEADING FOR HIMSELF AND ISRAEL (EXODUS xxxiii. 12-18).

A NEW year should be a time of thought, reflection, prayer, and holy dependence on God for guidance and grace. The *Subject* is Moses leading Israel and pleading for himself and his people. Moses! the "meekest of men," to whom "God spake face to face," who led Israel out of Egypt and through the wilderness, died on Mount Nebo, was buried by God, for whose body the devil "disputed," who appeared with Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration—how interesting, instructive, and appropriate the subject to the new year.

1. Moses, on his journey to Canaan, a type of ourselves. A. Moses and Israel on their journey (see verse 1). Thus far they had gone, and here is a crisis in their history. God's command is,

"Depart, go up hence." B. So we are on our journey to the heavenly Canaan! and here a pause at the beginning of the new year—a new stage on our journey, and God seems to speak to us by His providence, "Get thee up hence." Surely it is, and ought to be, a solemn time in our history.

2. Moses interceding for guidance, for God's presence, and a view of His glory. A. But before we proceed, *look back.* The review of their past journey is sad; they had sinned (ch. xxii.). God says "He would not go with them (ch. xxxii. and xxxiv. and xxxiii. 3). On hearing this "the people mourned, and no man put on his ornaments." Alas, for our past!

Moses asks—

1. "Show me *Thy way* (verse 13) that I may know Thee and find grace." Such should be our prayer. "I am the Way," says Christ.

2. For *God's presence.* "If Thy presence go not with us, carry us not up hence;" and so he pleads with God, and God answers (verse 17), "I will do this thing, for thou hast found grace in My sight," and so he prevails. What an encouragement to us this day!

3. But still further he asks, "I beseech Thee show me *Thy glory*" (verse 18), and God grants his prayer as far as it was possible (verse 19 to the end). So the Christian. "No man, indeed, hath seen God at any time," but "we beheld," says St. John in his Gospel (i. 14), "His glory as of the only begotten of the Father;" and St. Paul again, "We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord" (2 Cor. iii. 18).

Conclusion:—

A. See in Moses a *type of Christ* pleading for us. "He ever liveth to make intercession for us."

B. Be *encouraged to plead*, pray, and ask for grace, and light to see the way, for God's presence here, and a view of His glory here and hereafter. "So clearer light shall mark the road that leads me to the Lamb."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE PAGAN MORALISTS.

SIR,—Not very long ago a writer in the *Spectator* hazarded the assertion that the Hellenists had discovered the scattered fragments of the Sermon on the Mount in the "Enchiridion" of Epictetus and in the "Meditations" of Marcus Aurelius, this discovery being supposed to deprive the Sermon on the Mount of its claim to originality. I certainly venture to question this, and I should be glad to be informed on what authority such a statement could be made. If true, however, it would not be such a very wonderful feat on the part of the Hellenists, seeing that the "Enchiridion" belongs to a date half a century, and the "Meditations" to a date more than a whole century later than the Sermon on the Mount. Moreover, Epictetus was a native of Hierapolis, where in the Apostolic age a Christian community was to be found (Col. iv. 13); while Marcus Aurelius not only refers to the Christians by name, but also was the Emperor to whom Justin Martyr presented his Second Apology, which, however, did not prevent Aurelius from permitting a persecution.

The late learned Bishop Lightfoot, speaking of our Lord's parable in Matt. xxiv. 45, *sq.*, to which he says a passage in Epictetus (Diss. iii. 22, 2 *sq.*) "bears a strong resemblance," observes: "I can hardly believe that so strange a coincidence is quite accidental. . . . It favours the supposition that our Lord's discourses, in some form or other, were early known to heathen writers" ("The Epistle to the Philippians," p. 315, note 6). The Bishop also says: "As the speculations of Alexandrian Judaism had elaborated a new and important theological vocabulary, so also to the language of Stoicism . . . . . was due an equally remarkable development of moral terms and images To the Gospel which was announced to the world in 'the fulness of time' both the one and the other paid their tribute. As St. John (nor St. John alone) adopted the terms of Alexandrian theosophy as the least inadequate to express the highest doctrines of Christianity, so St. Paul (nor St. Paul alone) found in the ethical language of the Stoics expressions more fit than he could find elsewhere to describe in certain aspects the duties and privileges, the struggles and the triumphs, of the Christian life. But though the words and symbols remained substantially the same, yet on their application they became instinct with new force and meaning. This change, in either case, they owed to their being placed in relation to the central fact of Christianity, the Incarnation of the Son."

And again: "Those who assume the entire aim and substance of the Gospel to have been the inculcation of moral precepts, and who therefore rest its claims solely or chiefly on the purity of its ethical code, often find themselves sorely perplexed when they stumble upon some noble and true utterance of Jewish or heathen antiquity before the coming of Christ. A maxim of a Stoic philosopher or a Rabbinical schoolman, a saying of Plato or Confucious, startles them by its resemblance to the teaching of the Gospel. . . . They have not realised the truth that the same Divine Power was teaching mankind before He was made flesh. . . . They have failed to see what is involved in this Incarnation and its sequel. To those who have felt how much is implied in St. John's description of the Pre-incarnate Word as the Life and the Light of men; to those who allow the force of Tertullian's appeal to the 'witness of a soul naturally Christian'; to those who have sounded the depths of Augustine's bold saying, that what we now call the Christian religion existed from the dawn of the human race, though it only began to be named Christian when Christ came in the flesh . . . . it cannot be a surprise to find such flashes of Divine truth in men who lived before the coming of our Lord, or were placed beyond the reach of the Gospel. The significance of Christ's moral precepts does not lose, but gain, by the admission; for we learn to view Him no longer as One wholly apart from our race, but, recognising in His teaching old truths which,

In manhood darkly join,

we shall only be the more prompt to—

Yield all blessing to the Name
Of Him who made them current coin."

("Epistle to the Philippians," pp. 302, 327.)

The late Archbishop Trench, in his most valuable and interesting Hulsean Lectures for 1846, says : "In regard of . . . . the goodly maxims, the striking precepts, the memorable sayings which are gathered from the fields of heathen philosophy, and then sometimes used to depress the original worth of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles . . . . I may, in passing, remark, how many that are sometimes adduced of these are wholly deceptive as parallels to Christian truths . . . . how often they have, indeed, a very different significance from that which *we* first *put* in them, and afterwards educe from them. . . . . So long, indeed, as we regard God's revelation of Himself in Christ as a revelation merely of certain moral truths, it may be startling to find ought that is therein anticipated in any other quarter, But when we more rightly contemplate it as the manifesting of Life, that the Life was manifested and dwelt among us, then we feel that they who gave and could give precepts and maxims only, however precious these were, whatever witness they bore to a light shining in the darkness, to a Divine spark not trodden out in man, to a God nurturing the heathen, with all this yet gave not that which for man is the gift of gifts and blessing of blessings. . . . . That which differences Christianity from all other religions is not its theory of morals . . . . this is a most real difference . . . . but its difference is that it is life and power, that it transforms, that it transfigures, that it makes new creatures, that it *does*, and for all, what human systems only *promised to do*. and that for a few. Herein the essential difference resides. Men, for instance, before it came . . . . could speak worthy things, and could really feel them, about the beauty of overcoming their desires, of forgiving their enemies, of repaying injuries with kindness of coming to God with clean hands and a clean heart. Such sayings abound in every code of morals ; but the unhappiness was that they who uttered these sayings, and they who admired them, did little more than this. . . . . They delighted in them after the inner man, but in the actual struggle with evil they were ever weak to bring them to effect. There was a great gulf between the saying and doing, which never till in Christ was effectually bridged over" ("Christ the Desire of All Nations," Lecture I., pp. 163-167).

Did not Ovid, who may be regarded as the mouthpiece of the old pagan world, exclaim :—

> Video, meliora, proboque ;
> Deteriora sequor.

Did not Aristotle , the editor of the first Dictionary of Universal Information, say : "If mere treatises were sufficient of themselves to make men good, it would be our duty to provide ourselves with them. But the truth is that, though they may seem to have power to excite young men of liberal minds, and to make a character that is generous and truly fond of virtue, they have no power to persuade the multitude to what is virtuous and honourable" ("Ethics," Book X., ch. viii. 2).

Did not St. Paul irrefragably demonstrate that Greek wisdom and Roman power—all the old pagan religion and philosophy—had utterly and miserably failed, as the foul corruptions of heathendom everywhere cried aloud, to establish in the earth that righteousness which is the necessary condition of life in a universe the secret of which is "not mechanical, but moral," seeing it is the work of a righteous and faithful Creator. Hence the need for the manifestation of Christ as the wisdom of God and the power of God. Hence the need of the Gospel as "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. i. 16, 18-32 ; Acts xvii. 16-31 ; 1 Cor. i. 20-25). Our Saviour came to do the will of God, and to fulfil the aspirations and the Godward destiny of mankind. "He came not to destroy" anything except "the works of the devil," "but to fulfil." He is the Great Fulfiller. He came as "the Light of the World," as "the Light of Men"—that "true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (Matt. v. 17 ; John i. 5, 9, viii. 12).

> Whence is it He hath learned to speak?
> Say, Who His doctrine gave?
> A Prophet? Prophet, wherefore He
> Of all in Israel's tribes?
> He teacheth with authority,
> And not as do the Scribes.

Our Lord "taught as One having authority, and not as the Scribes," or even as the philosophers. The greatest of all the philosophers said : "We wait patiently until some one, either God or some inspired man, teaches us and removes the darkness from our eyes." Since these pathetic and prophetic words were written the Christian Church has for many centuries been proclaiming that "God has spoken unto us by His Son," "the darkness is past and the true Light now shineth" (Heb. i. 2 ; 1 John ii. 8).

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 27th, 1895.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Aldridge, Rev. John Mullings, M.A., Rector of Chalton-with-Clanfield and Idsworth; Rector of Meyseyhampton, Gloucestershire.

Alpe, Rev. Alfred John, L.Th., Curate of St. Stephen's, Norwich ; Rector of Thuxton, Norfolk.

Chandler, Rev. R. J., A.K.C., Rector of Stockbridge, Hants ; Rural Dean of Stockbridge.

Crofton, Rev. Mordaunt C., M.A., Vicar of St. George's and Rector of SS. Simon and Jude's, Norwich; Rector of Westbere, Kent.

Drake, Rev. Herbert, B.A., Curate of Christ Church, Sutton, Surrey ; Chaplain to the Currie Schools.

Edwards, Rev. Henry Powell, M.A., Rector of St. Andrew's near Cardiff; Rector of Llandevaud.

Elwes, Rev. E. L., M.A. ; Rector of Woolbeding, Sussex.

Eyton, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Chelsea, and Prebendary of St. Paul's ; Canon of Westminster.

Hall, Rev. R. S. Bracebridge, M.A., Rector of Weddington ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Warwickshire (Mr. H. Cunliffe Shawe).

Hancock, Rev. Leonard Rhys, M.A., Curate of Rotherham ; Rector of Brompton Ralph, Taunton.

Hayes, Rev. A. H., Curate of St. Matthew's, Ipswich ; Rector of All Saints', Lynn Regis, Norfolk.

Hinkley, Rev. T., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Leeds ; Vicar of Sowerby, Halifax.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Duncan, Rev. James Irwin, formerly Vicar of Christ Church, Carlisle, at Royston, on the 21st ult., aged 64.

Hemsted, Rev. John, thirty-three years Rector of Ickford, Bucks, at Whitchurch, Hants, on the 23rd ult., aged 78.

Houssemayne Du Boulay, Rev. George Pascal Keble, M.A., Priest-in-Charge of Misozwe, Universities' Mission to Central Africa, near Magila, on the 1st ult., aged 29.

Tasker, Rev. John Campbell Wheatley, at Sidmouth, on the 26th ult., aged 70.

Thompson, Rev. William, B.A., for fifty-five years Rector of Addingham, at the Rectory, on the 22nd ult.

Thornton, Rev. Francis Vansittart, M.A., Honorary Canon of Truro, formerly Rector of South Hill with-Callington, at Monart, Torquay, on the 27th ult., aged 79.

The Church of England Pulpit.

COMMANDMENT *V.* TRADITION.

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES GORE, M.A.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, March 3rd, 1895.

"Ye leave the commandment of God and hold fast the traditions of men."—St. Mark vii. 8.

JESUS and His disciples were in the busy, commercial district of Gennesareth, by the side of the inland sea. They were much beset by people who came to be healed by the great Prophet, or to listen to His teaching. While they were thus occupied, there came upon them Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem, that is to say, strict representatives of the ecclesiastical tradition from the great centre of religious observance. The newcomers noticed some neglect of a traditional observance, a ceremonial washing among our Lord's Galilean disciples. "Why," they ask of Jesus, "why do not Thy disciples wash their hands before they eat bread? Why do they walk not according to the traditions of the elders?" Now our Lord was not given to disparaging ecclesiastical authority. The Scribes and Pharisees, He said on another occasion, "sit on Moses' seat; all things, therefore, whatsoever they bid you, thus do and observe." But now He parries their question with another, far deeper and more searching. As Luther says, He places a wedge against their wedge, and thus drives the other back. "Why do ye make the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition, for Moses said, 'Honour'—and that in its practical meaning is help—'your father and your mother'; but ye suffer a man to say to his father or his mother, That in respect of which I might have been of use to you is *corban*, a gift. It is dedicated to God in the Temple, and ye suffer him to do nothing for his father or his mother. Thus have you made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." It is not at all hard to see how this abuse had grown up. Ecclesiastical authority, in the first place, where it falls a little below its higher purposes, has been ever prone to exalt what concerns the service of the sanctuary above what concerns the moral service of mankind. So it had been among the Jews. They had suffered any offering to the Temple to dispense from the normal moral service which men owe to their parents. And then, secondly, where ecclesiastical prescription or dispensation are upon slightly too low a moral level, there you can trust human selfishness to drag them still further down. And so, no doubt, among the Jews, people had found manifold ways in which they could nominally consecrate what in reality they retained for their own selfish uses. So the abuse had come into vogue, so it had spread, so in result the commandment of God had been deserted and the traditions of men had taken its place.

It remains for us to apply our Lord's rebuke to our own case. For we, too, have a word and commandment of God, a word of God deeper, completer, fuller by far than any given to the Jews. The Word of God has been spoken to us by the very Son of God incarnate, Jesus Christ. That word is faithfully recorded for us in the pages of the Gospel, and it is interpreted for us in manifold ways in the Apostolic epistles. We have the Word of God, and yet it is not hard to think of ways in which we have left the Word of God and substituted our own traditions. For, first of all, ecclesiastical authority has been at work on the lower level with us, as it was among the Jews. Let the eye of your mind run over the interval of centuries which separates the time of our Lord from the time just before the Reformation. Probably there are many in this congregation who in the past month have been reading Mr. Froude's fascinating volume about the "Life and Letters of Erasmus." If so, they know how men as good as Colet, as great as Erasmus, were looking at the ecclesiastical traditions of their own time. They saw, in the first place, that a great mass, a great fabric of ecclesiastical dogma, had grown up upon the original Gospel. It had grown to the point where it at least obscured and overcrowded that original deposit of truth which it was meant only to guard and present more forcibly and clearly to men's minds. Thus they cried out for a return to the simplicity of the Gospel. And again, they saw masses of ecclesiastical observances in the fulfilment of which men were allowed to be dispensed from the real moral severity of the claim of Christ. Thus there was a cry for a return to the moral reality of the Gospel. And you know that on its religious side this cry for a return to Christ was the great animating spirit of the Reformation. "Back behind the traditions of men we must go," they said, "to the Word of God."

And if we want to know how such abuse can have sprung up, the answer is not far to seek, and is worth noticing. It had come, in one word, from the neglect of Holy Scripture. It is worth your notice. There are two ways in which you may misuse the pages of the Bible. The Bible is, in the first place, misused when it is treated as a source from which each man can draw, by his own independent judgment, the religion which seems to him to come out of it. It is a misuse of Holy Scripture, that against which the Bible itself in all its books most vigorously protests. Look at each book of the New Testament in turn, and you will see that they were written for those who had been

already instructed in Christian doctrine—"that thou mayest know the certainty of those things in which thou wast already orally instructed." Those are the words of St. Luke's preface to his Gospel, and St. Paul in his Epistles again and again makes it plain, with the other Apostolic writers, that they were writing to build up in completer knowledge those who had already been instructed in the events of our Lord's life, in the moral claim of Christ, in the meaning of the threefold name of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in the teachings about baptism and laying on of hands, and the meaning of the breaking of the bread. That which you find pretty well represented in our own Creed and Catechism constituted that original tradition of the Church which it was bound to hand on from generation to generation; the Church to teach, the Bible to prove. That is the principle to which the New Testament itself bears most abundant witness.

But the Bible is abused again if it is not suffered to fulfil that function which it was intended to fulfil—the function of being the continual court of appeal, the continual criterion of Christian doctrine. Go back fifteen centuries. You would find John the Golden Mouthed, John Chrysostom, preaching to a vast congregation in the cathedral at Antioch. It was ages before printed books existed, but the copying of written books was so enormous a business, and books were so wonderfully cheap, that Chrysostom is able to assume, and to make emphatic again and again, that even the working men of his congregation ought to be able as easily to possess New Testaments as they possessed tools of their trade; and he charges them—preaching as he does on page after page of Holy Scripture—he charges them to go back and verify what he says for themselves in their books at home. Or, as an even older writer says, "Believe not what I say unless you find the demonstration thereof from Holy Scripture." It is the character of tradition always and everywhere, where it is left unchecked, to become hardened, stereotyped, one-sided, lowered in tone. The Bible was by God given us to produce a continual reversion to type; for teachers and hearers alike to be in continual contact with the highest record of inspired men. And whatever may be the faults or deficiencies of the Church of England, this, at least, is certain—that among the Churches of Christendom our Church stands truer than all to the original type of the whole of Church teaching, to the original idea by which the Church is to impart to us the primary teaching, and refer us back to the open Bible, to find there the confirmation or the correction of what is taught. So it is that ecclesiastical tradition can obscure the Word of God.

But there are, no doubt, a great many here who will be saying in their hearts, "After all, I am not so very ecclesiastical; you are not at all hitting me in what you say." Ah, my brethren! it is unfortunately possible to fall under the same condemnation as the Pharisee, even though you do not know what a phylactery means, though you do not fast twice a week, aye, or once a year, though you do not give tithes, aye, nor a fortieth part of what you possess. For consider how the social tradition works in exactly the same way to obscure the original force and meaning of the teaching of Christ. Take it on one point only, our Lord's teaching about wealth. And perhaps you will say, even at starting, "But our Lord's mode of teaching is parabolic, or by parable; what He says is very obscure; it is hard to reduce it to the literal terms of practice." Maybe, and perhaps some of those difficulties, occurring as they mostly do in the Sermon on the Mount, we may some of us have to consider on other occasions. For the present, let me only remind you that we have apostolic comments upon our Lord's teaching, and those apostolic comments present us in result with the same teaching, and freed from all kinds of parabolic ambiguity. Listen to St. Paul: "Godliness with contentment," he says, "is great gain. For we brought nothing into the world, for neither can we carry anything out; but having food and covering we shall be therewith content. But they that desire to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts, such as drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil: which some reaching after have been led astray from the faith and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows." Or, again, "If a man will not work neither let him eat." These—and there are many others like them—are quite plain words. Wealth, in the opinion of the Apostolic writers, is a responsibility, a trust for the good of others: its unlimited increase is an unlimited peril. Simplicity is a duty, luxury a sin. Riches are no kind of excuse for idleness and self-indulgence. In the days when to be a Christian was to incur the peril of persecution, this ideal was, if not of course perfectly fulfilled, at least as an ideal fairly maintained. Afterwards the voluntary poverty of the religious orders at least kept the ideal before the imaginations and the minds of men. But the religious orders fell in our country, the very ideal well-nigh passed out of the minds of men; nothing seemed more natural than that people should seek to be as rich as ever they could be, and should regard each increase of wealth as only an increase in the opportunities of enjoyment and luxury. Yet it is not, I think, possible steadily to listen to the words of Christ and His Apostles without feeling sure that, if our Lord was to come into the midst of our towns to-day, and to move about in our civilisation, He would find almost everything to condemn in current conception of the use and employment of wealth. For, think of it! Think of the fruitless idleness of a great part of the wealthy youth of our country! Think of the unlimited

claim made on life for amusement! Think of the money spent by old and young on such luxuries as champagne, flowers for decoration, on dress, far beyond the limits of seemliness or comeliness, on moving about from place to place abroad in foreign travels, away from the natural duties of life, without any kind of justification from the requirements of recreation or of health! Is it possible to think that our Lord would not have spoken severe words about things like this? In truth, the things we think we cannot do without tend to grow upon us at an amazing pace, unless we most deliberately set ourselves to check them. One of the greatest of living men I once heard say that luxuries are like the pieces of thread with which the Lilliputians tied Gulliver, each in itself was easy to break, but altogether they held him bound more tightly than strong cords. So are those things we suffer ourselves to think we cannot do without. Whatever may be the duty of the State in regard to wealth, it appears to be beyond question that it is the duty of the Church to urge upon the consciences of her members the teaching of Christ in regard to the responsibilities of wealth. For, on the other hand, think only for a minute of the vast amount of good which could be done by wealth, bestowed, not in casual, dribbling, indiscriminate charity, but bestowed alike with princely generosity and with strong, deliberate considerateness. There is hardly any limit to the difference which it might make in a period of years in our social state. And then we ask, Why is it, then, seeing we are all Christians, that we do not do the things that our Lord would have us do?

Brethren, in a word, it is just the strength of social tradition. One by one we should not dare to stand in the face of our Lord and set aside or explain away the meaning of his words. Together we dare to do it, solely because of this strength of tradition. The conscience of one or another of us is stirred, but we go home, we talk to one another, the wife to the husband, the children to the parent, one to another, friend to friend. We say, "Well, but these things cannot be wrong, for this person and that person, and society as a whole, does not think them wrong." So it is we encourage one another to ignore, to explain away, what words mean. Thus, *thus*, THUS! ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. It is thus, when we are face to face with this sort of peril, that there comes in the profound necessity for placing ourselves often in the presence of death. Death has been busy among us in these last weeks; it has touched us here in this Abbey; it has taken from us him who for eight-and-thirty years has fulfilled so faithfully in this place the duty, first of a Minor Canon, and then of Precentor. It would ill befit me, it would be impertinent in me, to speak much of him whose friendship, aye, whose acquaintance, I had not the privilege to have. But death has been busy in other fields also; it has touched all classes, many families—death and sickness—and when they are abroad they come to remind us that the moment will come when we all of us shall feel no more the power of tradition, and shall find ourselves in a strange and terrible solitude before the face of our Judge. For that is the central significance of Death: it takes us out of all the customary supports and associations and fellowships of life; it takes us where we can no longer look away or shut our ears to the one tremendous Voice; it plants us naked and alone before the face of Him our Judge, merciful and considerate—aye, infinitely merciful, infinitely considerate, to all honest effort—but the same Jesus Christ, Jesus of Nazareth, the same in character, the same in His inexorable and searching claim on human life, human faculties, and human good. There was a day when Zacchæus stood forth and said, "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have done any wrong to any man, I restore him fourfold." It was the first time Zacchæus had been brought into contact with our Lord, and that was the declaration in which he announced the way in which for the future he intended to regulate and model his life. And Jesus met that declaration with His royal welcome: "This day has salvation come to this house, forasmuch as this man also is a son of Abraham." There are moments in the life of all of us when we can look at life afresh, when there is a fresh beginning, a fresh opening, when we must plan and lay down the lines on which our lives are to be lived. It is at moments such as this that it matters supremely that we should be in full face of the teaching of our Lord. In any case the Church in its central essence must be safe. It is founded upon the rock of the Divine promise; it cannot fail. But in any time which is critical, in any time of transition, it matters, as far as the influence of the Church goes upon the social and national life, it matters supremely how many of those who call themselves by the name of Christ are really meaning to follow what His teaching is, and it matters never more than now. It is impossible to misunderstand the signs of the times in one respect. From all sides, from quarters the most unexpected, men are reaching out their hands and wanting to know what the real teaching and meaning of the Christ is. We look around, and the words are forced to our lips, "All men seek thee." It is just in a situation like this that everything depends on whether those who hold His faith and most loyally own His Name are really going to apply themselves to realise and to set in action the meaning of His teaching.

And thus I am going to venture, in these Sundays in Lent, to try and restate before you the meaning of the central verities and facts of our Lord's Person and Life; the meaning of His Humanity, the disclosure of His Godhead; His Birth of a Virgin; His rejection by the World; the meaning of His Expiation; the Glory of His

Resurrection. All these central verities and facts correspond to and sum up and embody great central elements in His teaching, the teaching which He gave to others. They carry us to the heart of what He was in Himself, and of what He taught.

Return to Christ! Herein is salvation, then; herein is the hope of social recovery; herein is the real hope and basis of Christian unity. But for this afternoon let me only implore you to remember the deadening power of tradition, unless you are on your watch against it, whether that tradition be ecclesiastical or be merely social. Remember the deadening power of tradition. Open your ears to hear afresh. "Ye that have ears to hear," says Christ, "take heed that ye hear."

THE DUTY OF THANKSGIVING.

By the Rev. H. HEBER EVANS, B.A., Oxon, Formerly Vicar of the Parish.

Sermon Preached in Holy Trinity Church, Mapperley, Derby.

"Praise the Lord, O my soul."—Psalm ciii. 1.

WHY ought we to praise the Lord? The answer is very simple — because He alone is worthy to be praised. As we all say sometimes in the words of the Psalms, "Who can express the noble acts of the Lord, or show forth all His praise"? (Psalm cvi. 2).

God, the Everlasting God, is the One Perfect Being. All else changes; God alone does not change. There is no need for God to change, because He is perfect. His power is perfect; without Him not even a sparrow falls to the ground (Matt. x. 29). He is mightier than the mightiest monarch. His wisdom is perfect. The wisest of men is but a little child compared with God. Who can deny the power and wisdom of God displayed in all the manifold works of creation? They are all around us. We cannot see the invisible God, but we cannot help seeing His wonderful works. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handywork" (John i. 18; Rom. i. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 16; Ps. xix. 1). How perfectly the tiniest insect is formed! What wonderful beauty and symmetry, what thought and power and skill is displayed in each leaf! What beautiful and finished work is to be seen in every flower! Could all the great painters who have ever lived paint one such beautiful picture as God paints at sunset, every clear autumn evening, on the western sky? How fearfully and wonderfully are our own bodies made! Composed as they are of many hundred different parts, yet these are all so perfectly joined and fitted together as to obey every impulse of our will. The union and harmony of our different members is so perfect that our earthly tabernacle, although of the earth, earthy, is the suitable dwelling, the fit instrument of our immortal spirit, made in the image of God Himself. The Psalmist was right when he said, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! In wisdom hast Thou made them all" (Ps. civ. 24). "His work is to be praised," "sought out of all them that have pleasure therein." "The merciful and gracious Lord hath so done His marvellous works that they ought to be had in remembrance" (Ps. cxi. 2-4).

God's goodness is also perfect. He is always working for the best object in the best way; although we sometimes find this hard to understand, because "His ways are not as our ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts" (Is. lv. 8). "His tender mercies are over all His works." "The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord" (Ps. xxxiii. 5, cxiv. 9). Who first thought of and created a mother's love? —the purest, tenderest, most unselfish love that all the earth can give. Was it not God? Heaven can give us, it is true, a still purer, tenderer, more unselfish love even than a mother's—"the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge" (Eph. iii. 19). It is because God is so perfectly good that "evil shall not dwell with Him." "He is of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity," and "He will by no means clear the guilty" (Exod. xxxiv. 7; Ps. v. 4; Habakkuk i. 13). It is because sin is doing such dreadful harm to the wonderful works and beautiful creatures which He has made that God hates and punishes sin with what we sometimes think such terrible severity. We must never forget, however, that although God is just, He is also merciful. He is "good and gracious, and of great mercy unto all who call upon Him. He is nigh unto all such as call upon Him faithfully" (Ps. lxxxvi. 5, cxlv. 18). He willeth not "that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. iii. 9).

But God would not be perfect if He were only powerful, wise, good, just, merciful. There is one other quality needed to constitute and make a perfect being. You will easily guess what it is—it is Love. Bold as these simple words are, they are most true:—

> A worm were better in his clod
> Than 'mid His worlds a loveless God.

If God were not loving, we might fear Him because of His irresistible power. We might praise Him with our lips in a dull, cold, distant way; but we could never praise Him from our hearts, because we could not love Him. How could we love God unless, with all His power, He were loving to the creatures of His hand? But that is just the blessed message of the everlasting Gospel: "God is love." We Christians "love Him, because He first loved us" (1 John iv. 8, 19). God commendeth—that is, shows or proves—His love to us —because that, while we were yet sinners, wicked, disobedient, rebellious sinners, Christ, the only Son of His love, died for the ungodly. Before we thought of or cared about God, God so loved us as to send His only Son to be our Saviour, to live as

our Example, to teach us the truth, to die for our sins, to rise again as our Friend and Advocate, that we might have hope (Rom. v. 8; Col. i. 13; John iii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 21; Eph. iv. 20, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4; Rom. iv. 25; Matt. xi. 19: 1 John ii. 1; Rom. xv. 4; 1 Tim. i. 1). That is the glorious message of the Gospel to each one of us; this is the chief thing for which we have to praise God—His great love in sending His own Son to be born into this world of sin and death to be the Saviour of every penitent sinner. But it is only real Christians who can praise God for this. Let us see that we are real Christians, and that we do praise God for our Saviour.

There are still many, many dark places in the earth where no sound of praise ever rises to the great Creator—only the oaths and curses of blaspheming sinners, and the groans and sighs of the helpless and oppressed. But a time is coming—fast coming, thanks be to God—when all the earth shall worship Him and praise His name (Ps. lxvi. 3). Shall we not pray for that time? Shall we not work for that time? Shall we not hasten the coming of that most blessed time? We can do so; everyone can do a little, and every little helps. No real Christian work is ever lost. It may seem quite thrown away and wasted, but it will tell in the end. Like the seed sown in the ground, although hidden for a while, it has life, and that life is certain, soon or late, to show itself. "Cast thy bread upon the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days" (Eccl. xi. 1). We have the great privilege, the grand opportunity, now during this our day of life, of spreading the Gospel till "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Is. xi. 9). Do not lose such an opportunity; it will soon be over for us all, and it will never come back to any one of us. Work for Christ now, "in this thy day" (Luke xix. 42).

But what, with respect to ourselves, are the chief things for which we have to praise God? First, He has created us. The Eternal God is the One Fountain of Life; He lived "before the mountains were brought forth or ever the earth and the world were made" (Ps. xc. 2)—long, long before there was a single man to till the ground—before, indeed, the world was fitted for us to live in, before the coal, which is now so useful to all and which gives employment to so many, existed even in the form of beautiful plants and growing trees. God, the Everlasting I AM, has given us one and all His wonderful gift of life (Gen. i. 26, ii. 7; Exod. iii. 14). Without Him no single one of us would be living. And He has made us for a good and wise and noble purpose—you may be sure of that—however much the lives of wilful sinners, blasphemers, drunkards, and others, who go on grovelling in sin, and who even glory in their shame, may seem to contradict this. We were one and all made for good, although some of us, perhaps, have deliberately chosen evil. Whatever troubles we may have to contend with, God's purpose in all is a purpose of love, to make us good—that in the end, if not now, we may be really happy. We ought to praise God for His great gift of life.

How are you using His gift? Are you throwing it away, wasting it in idle folly, or, still worse, are you spending the hours and days, which will never come back to you, in wilful sin? Whatever else you may have been made for, you may be quite sure of this, you were never made in order to do wrong. But, although God has created us, should we have lived all these years unless we had been taken care of? Unless God had watched over you every day, and night too, of your life, how would you ever have lived to grow up? Are there no accidents that cut short the life of the strongest? Who has guarded you? God. You would not be here alive and well to-day, unless God had thought about you and kept you every moment of your life (Acts xvii. 28; Matt. x. 29, 30). Have you ever praised and thanked Him for His loving care? Is it because of our own goodness that God has graciously preserved us? or is it that we may have time to turn from our sins and repent? If so, besides repenting, surely we all ought to praise God for His long-suffering mercy.

Then have you not had the love of parents and friends, and some of you the love of husband or wife and children? Who gave you these dear ones to love you? Who has watched over their lives, and, perhaps, restored them from sickness, or rescued them from accident—who but our faithful Creator Himself? Have you ever thanked Him?

Again, we do not generally realise how great a blessing good health is until we lose it and become ill. We take our enjoyment of health quite as a matter of course. But is that right? You need only walk through the wards of the Infirmary to see many sad and painful instances of sickness and ill-health. Suppose your Maker had willed that you should be quite helpless, or that you should suffer pain, could you have prevented it? Ought you not to thank God for your health and strength? And when we have been ill, who has mercifully blessed the means used and restored us to health? The most skilful doctor could do nothing to make us better unless God had graciously given His blessing. Have you never seen or heard of sick persons whom the most famous physicians failed to cure, and for whom the most potent medicines were of no avail?

Then have you never wandered in the slippery paths of sin? Have you, like the young man in the Gospel, kept the Commandments "from your youth up"? (Matt. xix. 20). There are not too many in any congregation who can truly say this. Who brought you back when you strayed from the fold? Surely it must have been the Good Shepherd Himself who came to seek and to save the lost (Matt. xviii. 11-13; Luke xv. 4-7). Who, when, perhaps, you were crushed and overwhelmed

with the sense of the awful evil and power of sin, seemed to whisper—

> What, fallen again? Yet cheerful rise,
> Thine Intercessor never dies.

It must have been that Saviour whom God has given us, who "ever lives to make intercession for us" (Heb. vii. 25). Had you reaped the full fruit, the just consequences of all the sin and wrong-doing of the years that are gone, would you be quite so well, quite so happy, quite so prosperous, as you are to-day? God has been good and merciful to you. "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He set your sins from you" (Gal. vi. 7; Ps. ciii. 12). Have you ever praised Him? Who received you back to the arms of His blessed love when you returned, like the prodigal, a penitent sinner, weary and worn and sad with your sin? Was it not your Heavenly Father, Who was always looking and longing for you to come back and fill your true place in His home, for which you were made and which none else could fill—knowing that you could never come to any real good, could never find any solid, lasting happiness, away from Him? Who wrapped the best robe of Christ's perfect righteousness round you, and rejoiced over you as a son alive from the dead? (Luke xv. 20, 22, 24; Rom. v. 15-21). Should you not in common gratitude say, "Praise the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me praise His holy name!" (Ps. ciii. 1).

> Praise, my soul, the King of Heaven,
> To His feet thy tribute bring,
> Ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven,
> Who like thee His praise should sing?

Who has held you up ever since you were born? Who has showered mercies and blessings on you all your life? Who has prospered the work of your hands, and given you every comfort and enjoyment you have ever known? Is it not God, the First and the Last, of Whom are all things, Who opens His hand and satisfies the desire of every living thing? (Is. xliv. 6; Ps. cxlv. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 6). Have you given Him the glad, free praise of joyful lips, and the only thank-offering God cares for—the thank-offering of a grateful, loving heart, and of a redeemed and holy life? Are you trying to keep His commandments, to do His will, to walk in His holy ways? Are you hating sin and doing good?

And last and chiefest of all, have you thanked God for His great gift—the gift of a Saviour to save you from your sins, and this Saviour none other than His own and only beloved Son? All His other gifts would have been useless to you without this, the greatest gift of all. You would only have hurried madly down the broad, smooth road leading to destruction, to find, as so many reckless sinners have found, that the wages of sin is death, if the Good Shepherd had not in love held His strong arm round you to keep you close to Himself (Matt. vii. 13; Rom. vi. 23; John x. 14, 15, 27, 28). Do you thank God from your heart for His unspeakable gift to you of His only Son, to be the perfect Saviour you need? (2 Cor. ix. 15). Do you show that you value His great gift by obeying this Saviour and living as His true disciple—as a real Christian should live? God's gift is thrown away unless you use it. Do you follow Christ every day of your life, as a true Christian, not in name only, but in deed and in truth? and do you, instead of encouraging others to do wrong, try to lead them from sin to the only Saviour of sinners, Christ Jesus, our Lord? If so, your heart will gladly echo these words of the Psalmist, which will fitly conclude what has been said: "Praise the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits; Who forgiveth all thy sin and healeth all thine infirmities; Who saveth thy life from destruction, and crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies."

"Praise the Lord, O my soul; while I live will I praise the Lord; yea, as long as I have any being, I will sing praises unto my God" (Ps. ciii. 1-4, cxlvi. 1).

THE British and Foreign Bible Society, which held its ninety-first anniversary meeting last week, seems to be abandoning, to some extent, at any rate, its conservative position in regard to Biblical criticism. The anniversary sermon in Westminster Abbey was preached by Professor Ryle, whose views on the subject are not precisely those which have hitherto been supposed to be held by the leaders of the society. A sermon under the auspices of the society for the benefit of its Nonconformist supporters was also preached in Westbourne Park Chapel by Dr. Clifford.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—"Resist the tempter" (James iv. 7). Introduction.—This is one of the many blessed promises recorded in Holy Scripture for our encouragement and help in the journey of life. What is it to resist? How do soldiers resist? The good soldiers of our Lord Jesus Christ have weapons. Let us look briefly what weapons we may use in the combat of sin and temptation:—1. The first weapon must be prayer. Without the use of this we shall fall and suffer defeat. Many examples to prove the value and importance of prayer are to be found in Holy Scripture, Daniel, David, Nehemiah, and many others. 2. The second weapon must be the Word of God. The blessed Saviour is our great model and pattern in this matter. When He defeated the temptations of Satan, he used Scripture. Thus, brethren, we should be always armed with the sword which is the Word of God. Let us learn to use constantly these two weapons together, and fight the Lord's battles against Satan and his kingdom. Remember at the same time that we have our own sinful heart to overcome, and nothing but the grace of God will enable us to do this, or pursue the narrow way which leads to heaven. We are not able to fight alone; we need One who is stronger, One that is possessed of all power.

> O keep me in Thy heavenly way,
> And bid the tempter flee;
> And never, never let me stray
> From happiness and Thee.

"Resist the devil and he will flee from thee."—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 11, 1895.

"RE-MARRIAGE" AFTER DIVORCE.

THE action of the Rev. Wm. Black at a service of marriage held lately in St. Mark's, North Audley Street, will be justified if it brings to settlement a much vexed question.

What is the law about re-marriage after divorce? And what is the duty of the clergy in respect to it? Actually the questions are two. Re-marriage has nothing to do with the clergy. In this country, since the year 1857, marriages may be dissolved under certain circumstances, and the parties left free to form other ties. The right or wrong of the divorce laws cannot be discussed now, such legislation seemed to meet a social need, and was based upon ancient and practically unbroken custom. As far as forming legal unions goes there is no doubt that divorced persons are entirely and absolutely free, and any attempt to hinder them is an unwarrantable interference with the liberty of the subject.

But it is quite another thing when a sacrament of the Church is claimed by such persons. For the law of the Church is as clear as the law of the land; and that law is that the bonds of Holy Matrimony are only loosed in death. "As long as ye both shall live" are the emphatic words of our Prayer Book. It is plainly a farce to utter the solemn asseveration, "Those whom God hath joined together, let not man put assunder" as it has lately been uttered at the claim of a man in whose case it had already been set at naught; it is flouting the Liturgy to proclaim its life-long consecration over people whose partners are still alive. The Church recognises, and always has recognised, separation in cases where it is the lesser of two evils and scandals, it does not compel two people to live together in defiance of all sentiment of love and honour, and decency. But no loyal Churchman, either priest or layman, can go further, and claim the absolute severance of the marriage tie. And so it stands to reason that he cannot consent to the profanation of a sacrament, and the blasphemy of a religious farce.

The ecclesiastical and civil positions, however, are not incompatible. In its ecclesiastical aspect marriage is a sacrament of the Church. In its civil aspect it is a contract between two persons for mutual advantage. A sacrament cannot be dissolved, a contract may be. And there is no reason in law why two persons having dissolved one contract, should not make another. Churchmen would not complain if divorced persons took advantage of their civil freedom to contract other legal obligations. The registrar's office is always open to such persons, and the unions cemented there are for all merely civil purposes as good as any made anywhere else. Unfortunately the divorce laws go further than this. While recognising the law of the Church up to this point, that no priest can be compelled to read the marriage service for a divorced person, they allow, it has been suggested that they compel, the use of the parish church, provided that a priest be found willing to read the service. And it is thus made possible for the Liturgy to be parodied and the Church profaned by the unscrupulous, the disloyal, the ignorant, or the timid, and a certain confusion is created in the minds of some of the clergy as to what their duty is. Cases have even occurred when clergymen have quite innocently officiated at such services, by no means liking the task, but deeming themselves bound to undertake it. It cannot be too widely known that, by the law of 1857, no clergyman can, under any circumstances whatever, be compelled to officiate at the marriage of any divorced person. In claiming his liberty he is doing no wrong to the parties, who have the machinery of the civil contract open to them.

The use of the church, and the issue of a marriage license, raise other questions. With regard to licenses, it is probably the case that persons legally qualified to claim them can enforce their claim. But it has not yet been decided. It is much to be wished that it had. The use of the church is also a moot point. The law appears to compel it, yet the law has never been enforced, and it is not easy to see how a clergyman who resolutely refused to lend his church could be coerced into doing so. It is probable that the Ordinary would have the power of vetoing any legal proceedings to that end, and it is pretty certain, in that case, that the veto would be exercised. Moreover, the clergy have it in their own hands. When the licence is issued and the church is opened, the willing priest must still be found. And if he is not forthcoming all the proceedings fail. In not compelling the services of the priest,

the Legislature really concedes the whole position. And we are fain to believe that, as time goes on and the whole question is better understood, the priest willing to profane his office will be harder and harder to find. For in this matter the Church takes ground that is unimpeachable. The foundations of morals and of society are planted upon the marriage tie—facility of divorce has always gone hand in hand with moral decadence, of which it is at once the effect and cause. In the long run, we must come to this, that marriage is either a life-long union or a partnership at will. In pronouncing for the former, the Church is well aware that suffering must be entailed upon individuals, but it is for the common good. Individuals suffer terribly when marriage is robbed of all its joys by disease, or insanity, or crime. The partner of a paralytic, or a maniac, or a felon suffers much. But we feel that society would suffer more in attempting to find such persons artificial means of release from suffering. And the Church lays down the same law for those who are unhappily yoked with adulterers. Individual freedom and happiness must sometimes be sacrificed. Unfortunately the heads of the Church have not always done their duty. Especially we have to thank the inconsistency, dishonesty and downright immorality of the mediæval Papacy for the anomalous conditions of our marriage laws. The system of dispensation which has for centuries contrived the evasion of the Church's law has shrouded the law with uncertainty, and given it an appearance of arbitrariness which has hidden its true character, as well as harmed its dignity and weakened its influence. It is well that all loyal members of the Church should understand its true teaching about marriage, and realise that while leaving the civil aspect of the marriage-contract entirely out of the question, the sacrament of Holy Matrimony cannot be suffered to be parodied and profaned by the true sons of the Church.

CHURCH NOTES.

FATHER BLACK'S recent protest, at St. Mark's, North Audley-street, against the re-marriage (we use the word for convenience) of divorced persons has been the talk of the week. It remains to be seen whether it will lead to any collective action on the part of the Bishops, but the feeling among Churchmen is strong as to its necessity. Men who have no idea of following Lord Halifax and the Duke of Newcastle in giving up the defence of the Church as by law established, and who are not convinced of the wisdom of Mr. Black's proceeding, are nevertheless of opinion that the question has now been raised in such a manner that it cannot be put aside.

The *Guardian* seems to us a little premature in saying that "the action or inaction of the Bishop of London in the matter will give very great grief and pain to a large number of Churchmen." We have not yet heard what the Bishop has to say, except in an indirect way, but there is no doubt of his having written to a clergyman (not Dr. Ker Gray) who seems to have been asked to perform the service, that he had no power to prevent his doing so, but that no consideration would induce him to perform such a service himself. The real question is, whether a bishop can legally forbid the issue of marriage licenses to persons who have been legally divorced. It would be interesting to have that settled by an application on the part of someone who had been refused for a mandamus.

The Chancellor of London, Dr. Tristram, is fully of opinion that in this diocese, at any rate, the Bishop has no authority to forbid licenses in the cases in question. He also rules that the right of protest in church, claimed by Father Black, is confined to a marriage by banns, and that Mr. Black has consequently been guilty of the offence of brawling. Lord Halifax has, in the meantime, brought a Bill into the House of Lords for altering the Divorce Act in the sense which he and his friends desire.

The *Church Times* believes that the Church has only to put on a bold front in order to bring about a change in the law or a partial abrogation of the law. "No one need be frightened," it says, "because the law of the Church is in conflict with the law of the State. Does any one suppose that the ministers of the Established Kirk in Scotland, for instance, would be forced to sanction acts of which their Church does not approve? Our clergy, in like manner, need not submit to any such humiliation.

The Pope's letter to English Christians was referred to sympathetically by Canan Body in a recent sermon in Durham Cathedral. We ought to be moved by it, he said, to more diligence in praying for the restoration of peace to Christendom, but so long as the Infallibility dogma remained, the situation was hopeless. Mr. Body went on to speak of alleged and real Romanising in the English Church. Some things were called Romanising which were nothing more than bringing into practice and teaching the principles of our formularies. But there was real Romanising, he added, in the case of disloyal individuals who, in defiance of authority, introduced forms of devotion which contradicted those principles. As a specimen of what he meant, he read from a manual intended for the use of Anglicans a formula, in which the persons using it are instructed to commit their souls to the keeping of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

Mr. Athelstan Riley, who has just been elected Master of the Association for the Promotion of the unity of Christendom, is delighted with the Pope's appeal. "That a Pope should address us in any such language is," he says, "no small gain to the cause of unity.

Prebendary Eyton's appointment to succeed Dr. Farrar at Westminster seems to be taken pretty much as a matter of course. It was assumed that only "a Liberal and something more" would be chosen, for the present Government has no idea, in distributing honours and emoluments, of recognising merit in an opponent, and Mr. Eyton had no doubt respectable claims to recognition. The *Church Times* remarks on the appointment:—"The members of the Liberal Churchmen's Union who scoff at the defenders of what they superciliously term the 'loaves and fishes' of the Establishment are not backward in taking their fair share of them. Is there any clerical member of that august body not now provided for?"

The Rochester Diocesan Magazine for May contains a letter from the Bishop, in which he says that he is now able to attend to all ordinary diocesan correspondence, and for more than that he is not encouraged to hope just yet. He adds:—"Some quiet work in committees and interviews awaits me when we return, as I hope, to London a few weeks hence, and I secretly cherish my own "unauthorised programme for the rest of the summer, but how far it can be accomplished depends upon a fiat not yet issued by the authorities to whom I owe obedience. Especially am I anxious, if possible, to take the Ordination on Trinity Sunday, and to preside over a part at least of the Diocesan Conference in the following week. But these hopes are built upon no sure foundation, and to entertain them is perhaps no more than a pleasing fancy."

If there is any living clergyman whom everybody respects it is Archdeacon Denison. Universal sorrow will be felt at the news that he was unable to hold his visitation at Taunton in person. In his charge, which was read by Prebendary Askwith, he dwelt with the spirit of indifference and compromise in religion, the New Criticism, and the attack upon the Church in Wales. The venerable archdeacon—he is venerable in every sense—is now fast approaching his ninetieth year.

On Easter Day there were 986 communicants at St. John's, Cardiff. At Roath, a suburb of Cardiff, there were 1,700 communicants in the three churches; at Meifod, an agricultural parish notorious for its refusal to pay tithes a few years ago, 96, out of a population of less than a thousand; at Aberdare, a colliery centre, 946; at Aberystwith, 836; and at Brymbo, where Sir G. O. Morgan lives, 145, an increase of 50 on last year. These numbers will compare very favourably with those in English dioceses.

At the Liberal Unionist meeting at Shrewsbury, one of the speakers against Disestablishment—Mr. J. A. Williams, of Llandaff—was a Nonconformist. Dr. E. E. Permewan, Vice-Chairman of the Redruth Radical Club, was one of the speakers in defence of the Church in Wales at St. Stephen's, Bramwell. At Chalton, besides Alderman Phillips, a staunch Radical, who is doing such yeoman's service on Church defence platforms, the speakers included Mr. Adam Stigant, a life-long Dissenter; Mr. H. C. Richardson, Superintendent of the Congregational Sunday School; and Dr. J. V. Bell, J.P., who was born and bred a Dissenter.

Mr. W. Baines, a Congregationalist, of Woodstone, writing to the *Peterborough and Hunts Standard*, in reply to someone speaking in favour of Disestablishing the Welsh Church, says, "It appears to me that Dissenters are thinking and talking, but the Church of England is doing. I find the Church parson with a moderate income giving a great deal more help to the people in times of distress than many a Dissenting minister doubly paid. Yet they have the impertinence to say that they are most fitted to the times and the people."

We quote with much pleasure some excellent advice which is given by the *Guardian* to Churchmen in doubt whether they ought to support Liberal Unionist candidates who are not opposed in principle to Disestablishment. Suppose, it says, that in a number of constituencies sufficient to determine the majority in the next Parliament Radical candidates are returned through the abstention of over-scrupulous Churchmen. In that event there will be a Radical Government in power, and a Welsh Disestablishment Bill, at least, will be carried. "If, on the other hand, Churchmen in these constituencies study the practical consequences of their votes, and support the Liberal Unionist candidate without asking him to give any pledge about Disestablishment, the Unionist majority in the next Parliament is assured. By the help of that majority a Government strongly committed against Disestablishment comes into power, and the question disappears for at least six years, and very probably for a quite indefinite time."

There can be no answer to this reasoning. When great questions are at stake, it is not so much the opinions of individual candidates that must be regarded as the policy of the party which they mean to support. Mr. Chamberlain, for example, holds, as a pious opinion, that Church and State ought to be disconnected, but no man has done quite so much to prevent the coming into power of the party which is pledged to give practical effect to that opinion.

Laymen who find it helpful to go into retreat occasionally may be glad to know that an opportunity for doing so will be afforded at St. Paul's Cathedral on Saturday evening and Sunday, the 18th and 19th inst. The Rev. J. P. F. Davidson, of St. Matthias, Earl's Court, will be the conductor, and particulars of the arrangements may be had from Mr. E. S. Hodgkinson, 48, Grosvenor Road

THE "TIMES" ON ARMY EXPENDITURE.—The *Times* brings a grave charge against the Army Department of the Government as follows:—"If there are in the House any genuine and capable economists, there is a wide field for their efforts in the Army Estimates. In the Navy we get value for our money and have something to show which is a substantial equivalent. In the Army, on the contrary, we have a very poor return for the enormous sums we spend. There is no reason why there should not be units of defence in the Army as in the Navy, and why the cost of an efficient cavalry or infantry regiment should not be as easily arrived at as the cost of an ironclad in fighting order. But from the Army Estimates no human ingenuity can extract the cost of any given service. By what certainly has the air of elaborate design, everything is confused and jumbled in the most extraordinary manner with everything else. The result is that useful criticism—that is to say, business criticism directed to particular points—is next to impossible. Every complaint is met by a series of double shuffles, and an optimist War Minister actually jeers at the attempts of critics to find solid standing ground in the maze of deceptive figures his Department puts forth. The control of the House of Commons, or of the Treasury, is a farce, so far as the Army is concerned, for there can be no control, in the absence of information, accurate, complete, and detailed. This the War Office takes exceedingly good care that no one shall obtain. It is easy to see that we are baffled and deceived; it is not so easy to get at the specific points which alone enable a critic to do anything effective. Hence the beginning of real reform in military matters must be to enforce the demand for clear and accurate accounts, in which it shall be possible to ascertain what we pay for men, what for materials, what for every class of service and product, and, not least, what for general administration—an item at present obscured with special and peculiar care."

GOD LIVING IN THE WORLD.

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., stated :—

Advanced science, admitting that things were made visible by differentiated action of forces on matter, these forces being representative of Eternal Power, acknowledged a truth older than the Bible—that all things are by the Almighty. The Truth greatest of all truths being thus affirmed, we proceed to give it a Christian aspect. The first operation of salvation by the Lord Jesus is to bring individuals, personally and consciously, into closer relationship with God. The second work is the drawing of these men into a communion and fellowship for establishing the kingdom of heaven on earth. God makes the individual, God makes the Church ; the individual to be the social family unit, the Church a social brotherhood dwelt in by the Holy Spirit. Changes in the Lord's mode of work are advances, are not by fluctuations of will, any more than the culminating processes of creation show vacillation. There is in the Lord's preaching that adaptation to the capacities of the Apostles and other hearers which we find analogy of in the varied action of forces to effect organic changes and physical modifications.

The Church is universal, national, local.

As universal, the Church is built on Christ, the Rock, by confession, like that of St. Peter, all opposing forces will be cast down (Rev. xix. 20). Things perishable will be changed into the imperishable. The only master is the Divine Master.

The Church is national. When Peter's confession became that of the other Apostles, and of those whom the Apostles set apart to the ministry, they had the power of Peter. In every land whither the Gospel came there a Church was established. Jerusalem did not rule, nor Rome dominate, nor Athens find the brains, nor Corinth the fashion. Peter was corrected by Paul, and Paul conferred with the Apostles. He was chief authority in every land who thither had brought and chiefly preached the Good Tidings of Life.

The Church is local—sometimes in a house where two or three gathered, but more specially that congregation in a town or village, where the Word was read, where the Sacraments were duly administered, where things were arranged in some appointed order.

The first ministers were the Apostles appointed by the Lord, and they, by His authority, called others ; thus the ministry was maintained and the Lord's Presence in the Church universal, national, local, as a living Person, was manifested, savingly known, and rejoiced in, God, as the Saviour, redeeming ; God, as the Holy Ghost, sanctifying ; God, as the Creator, manifested Himself. Surely, as seed-time is followed by harvest, and the night by day, so surely will come the Day of Judgment, and the Church, putting off all her weakness as an earthly rule, will be clad with celestial glory and power.

Subject next Wednesday, "Things in General."

ARCHDEACON BROOKE is still indisposed, and on Thursday, the 2nd inst, his charge was read by the the Rev. F. R. Grenside, a rector of Thornhill, at the Dewsbury parish church.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

SIR,—The Pope's late Encyclical on the Re-union of Christendom, no doubt claims particular attention, as good principle alone can give true freedom to a people. As regards the expression, "the Re-union of Christendom," Christendom is always in unity with itself ; therefore, what I suppose the Pope desires to promote by his Encyclical is the advancement of unity among professing Christians. Now what we need especially to consider are the terms the Pope proposes to bring us in closer agreement on the religious question. Now these do not seem to me to be of a reasonable nature. For instance, instead of exhorting us all to exercise good inquiry, and, according to the teaching of St. Paul, to "Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good," he demands entire obedience to his commands, and condemns as heretics those who are not entirely submissive to the laws of the Roman Catholic Church. Now this, I think, is a very arbitrary course to pursue, for man is liable to go astray in his opinions, and therefore, if we give ourselves up to the care of a fellow-mortal without due consideration, we may be led away from what is right to be done. That perfect liberty to exercise good inquiry is in accordance with the law of reason, I will bring to notice the account in Acts xvii., where we find that those who searched into the truths of history, from a desire of well-informing their minds, became more ennobled than those who neglected to do so. There is one extremely important subject which arises in reflecting over the Pope's terms to promote unity of belief, and it is, what about the Inquisition? Would it be right, as the law of the Roman Catholic is stated to be *semper eadem*, to become a Roman Catholic and place ourselves under the rigour of this institution with all the horrors of its past history? The Pope calls upon the people to offer prayer to the Blessed Mary. Before he does this I think he would require to give us some good evidence that she is able to hear our supplications. It is one thing to merely pray, and quite another to pray aright. The heathen worship their idols, but before they do so they should well satisfy themselves that wood and stone can hear and understand. In the book of God's holy law we are taught to pray to God. Our Lord's teaching on this point of doctrine is when we pray to pray to Our Father in heaven (Matt. vi. 9). Let us observe in the Old Testament how the prophets always offered up their petitions to God. The testimony of Scripture cannot fail to be right, for a God of justice and love would not undertake to judge His creatures without affording them a law to warn and direct them. "For where no law is, there is no transgression" teaches the Apostle Paul (Romans iv. 15). If the Blessed Mary were the immaculate being as taught by the Pope, how is it we read of her saying, as recorded at Luke i. 47, "And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." And again at Luke i. 55 we find her to have said, "As He spake to our fathers, to Abraham and to his seed for ever." In this Scripture the Beloved Mary makes no reference to her being the Queen of Heaven, but informs us that

she was a descendant of Abraham. A Roman Catholic party called Ransomers has come forward in the cause of the conversion of England to the Popish system, and I perceive by the Press that in dealing with their opponents they do not exercise that peaceable and loving spirit which are the signs of a truly converted mind. "Wherefore by their fruits shall ye know them" are the words of the Saviour (Matt. vii. 20). A chief among the Ransomers, the Rev. Philip Fletcher (formerly a clergyman in the Church of England) is reported in the *Bournemouth Observer* of the 4th inst., in his giving an address on the "Re-union of Christendom," to have stated in his allusion to schismatics, "By that term schismatics he did not mean to use an opprobrious word, because those who were schismatics now were not so from their own fault, because they were born and brought up as such." The rev. gentleman it appears to me is much astray in making this statement, for if the Holy Scriptures are given to guide our race in safety from evil how can a man be unaccountable for the wrong he commits? Had he remained a member of the Church of England and made the Bible his rule of faith he might have well understood that all men who are blest with the powers of reason are accountable beings, as taught at Romans xiv. 12, "So then everyone of us shall give an account of himself to God."

J. T. DOCKER.

Worthing, May, 1895.

THE PEACE CONGRESS OF 1895.—It has been decided to hold the next Universal Peace Congress, for 1895, at Luxembourg, during the ensuing summer. Luxembourg is one of the most picturesque cities in Europe, and will, in itself, contribute no small attraction to visitors on the occasion.—Mr. Mark Howarth, of Liverpool, writes a timely letter in the *Liverpool Mercury*. When, on the one hand, there is a compact, well-organised, and successful, private Parliamentary Committee to promote the increase of Armaments, the Peace Party in the House seem "all abroad," or divided. They only mustered thirty-two, on the division supporting Sir W. Lawson's protest in the House last month; and only about twenty Members were present whilst that protest was being raised by him and his Peace allies. Mr. Howarth says in his letter:—"I appeal to you if steps cannot be taken to form something like cohesion amongst our so-called Peace Members of Parliament. When Mr. Robertson made his naval statement recently, 'prodigious' both in expenditure and in adding to the already demoniacal means of destruction, not a voice was heard in protest against it, and I am disgusted beyond all measure, as I am sure many of our Peace friends are, at the professions of the Peace party on the platform and their actions in the House of Commons. Surely here is an opportunity for enforcing the neglected Newcastle programme of the Liberal party; and no charge of harassing the Government can be made by those who propose a reduction in the expenditure on the Army and Navy. In the French Chamber they have been crying out at our superior naval force as compared to theirs; and why this insane race for bloated armaments should continue I fail to see."—The paucity of numbers of M.P.'s who took part in the late protest against armaments afresh proves that the best economy of peace effort is to devote labour to the organisation of local pressure upon Parliamentary representatives and upon the working of the local journals into the cause. Meetings are good, but Parliamentary and Governmental pressure, well maintained, are still better. And this must be done by each locality for itself, if it is to be done at all. The more correspondence with, and heckling of, M.P.'s and members of the Government, the better, especially in view of the General Election, which cannot now be very distant. As to the masses, a Durham newspaper correctly remarks:—"Ninety-nine of every hundred persons will readily assent to all the denunciations of war that may be uttered; but as soon as a scare of any kind is started the bull-dog instinct comes into play and reason leaves the stage for a time."

THE NEED FOR PUBLIC SLAUGHTER-HOUSES.—At a meeting of the Church Sanitary Association held at the Church House, Westminister, under the presidency of Dr. Norman Kerr, a paper contributed by Mr. Francis W. Clark, Medical Officer of Health, Lowestoft, on "The Need for Public Slaughter-houses," was read by the Rev. Canon Reith. The writer of the paper said there were numerous Acts designed to prevent the adulteration of food, but the motive of these had been for the most part the purely commercial one of depreciated value, and not the hygenic one of wholesomeness. The cocoa and vinegar sold by the grocer were sampled, and penalties inflicted if they were not pure, but when it came to our meat supplies, people were content to purchase anything provided only that "it looked all right." Few sanitary authorities had seen the wisdom of providing for the due and proper slaughtering and the adequate inspection of all animals for human food, and a lesson might well be learnt from our Continental neighbours, who were far ahead of us in this respect. The slaughtering of animals for food was an operation which must necesarily be attended by a certain amount of nuisance and danger to the health of those in the immediate vicinity unless it was carried out with the most ample sanitary conveniences and appliances, and therefore the English system of private slaughter-houses must be fraught with danger to the public health. The stabling of cattle, sheep, and pigs in the actual slaughter-house itself were among the least of the defects of these private slaughter-houses, while overcrowding, deficiency of light and of ventilation were to be found in almost all of them. The greatest danger, however, of the English system of slaughtering arose from the failure to detect and destroy all diseased and unwholesome carcases, and as a consequence much flesh was constantly offered for sale, especially in the poorer quarters, which was unfit for human food. It was unquestionable that tubercule could be conveyed to man by the injestion of the flesh of tuberculous cattle, and it was an admitted fact that an appreciable proportion of English cattle were tuberculous. One of the most important factors in the prevalence of consumption throughout England was the unrestricted use of milk from tuberculous cows, and the eating of imperfectly cooked tuberculous beef. The public must be taught that they cannot estimate the quality of meat by a mere casual inspection, and he hoped that the Church Sanitary Association, and the clergy generally, would try and rouse public opinion to a truer recognition of the value of sound and wholesome food. After some remarks from the Chairman, Canon Reith, the Rev. M. C. F. Morris, and the Rev. E. G. C. Parr, the proceedings closed.

MANY and various are the complaints against the clergy which are made from time to time at the annual vestry meetings. At St. Helen's, Blackburn, this year, the people's churchwarden said he expressed the general desire of the parishioners where he asked their clergyman to preach shorter sermons. Several ladies had fainted on recent Sunday evenings, and in view of the approach of hot weather, he felt bound to make this request. The vicar took the suggestion with good temper, and promised that he would endeavour to act upon it.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alford, Rev. Henry Powell, M.A., Vicar of Woodbury-Salterton, Exeter; Rural Dean of Aylesbeare.

Birley, Rev. H. H., Junior, M.A., Vicar of Pelton; Incumbent of the Ven. Bede Church, Sunderland.

Boldero, Rev. John Herbert, Curate of Stow; Vicar of Martin, Lincoln.

Bourke, Rev. the Hon. George Wingfield, M.A., Rector of Pulborough; Rural Dean of Storrington.

Bourne, Rev. Harry Campbell, M.A., Chaplain of All Saints', Dieppe; Rector of Ashingdon-cum-South Fambridge, Essex.

Bradshaw, Rev. C. J., M.A., Curate of St. John's, Kidderminster; Vicar of Bollington, Altrincham.

Buswell, Rev. H. D., Honorary Canon of St. James's Cathedral, Port Louis; Archdeacon of Seychelles and Sub-Dean.

Claxton, Rev. Hugh Albert, M.A., Vicar of Gildersome, Leeds; Vicar of St. Mary's, Riddlesden, Keighley.

Edwards, Rev. Howell Powell, M.A.; Vicar of Llandevaud, Newport.

Ensor, Rev. G., M.A., Vicar of German; Rural Dean of Peel, and Surrogate.

Ferrier, Rev. E., M.A., Government Chaplain, Castletown; Rural Dean of Castletown, and Surrogate.

Flower, Rev. Willoughby, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Ballarat, and Canon of Ballarat Cathedral; Vicar of Christ Church Cathedral, Grafton, Archdeacon of Grafton, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Grafton and Armidale.

French, Rev. R. J., Honorary Canon of St. James's Cathedral, Port Louis; Archdeacon of Mauritius and Bishop's Commissary.

Hay, Rev. R. S., Curate of St. Ives, Leadgate, Durham; Curate-in-Charge of Hylton, Sunderland.

Hicks, Rev. Walter, B.A., Curate of Messingham, Lincoln; Diocesan Missioner.

Hubbard, Rev. C. E., M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester.

Hutchinson, Rev. H., M.A., Vicar of New Clee; Rector of Clee-with-Cleethorpes, Grimsby.

Jackson, Rev. H. L., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's-with-St. Benedict's, Huntingdon; Commissary to the Bishop of Christchurch, New Zealand.

Jessopp, Rev. Augustus, D.D., Rector of Scarning, Norfolk; Honorary Canon in Norwich Cathedral.

Jones, Rev. H. Adney Woolston, Incumbent of St. Thomas's, Beau Bassein; Incumbent of St. Nicholas's (Mariners') Church, Port Louis, Mauritius.

Kempthorne, Rev. John Augustine, M.A., Curate of St. Aidan's, Gateshead-on-Tyne; Vicar of St. Mary's, Rochdale.

Kissack, Rev. E. W., B.A., Rector of Ballaugh, and Rural Dean of Peel; Rural Dean of Ramsey.

Kneale, Rev. T. R., M.A., Vicar of Rushen, Isle of Man; Surrogate.

Lambert, Rev. Edgar, M.A., Rector of Heene, Worthing; Senior Chaplain of the Mersey Missions to Seamen.

Ley, Rev. A., M.A., Vicar of Sellack; Secretary of the National Society for the Archenfield Deanery.

Macmanus, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of Somerby, Oakham; Rector of Broughton, Northants.

MacVay, Rev. Thomas, Curate of Killoran; Incumbent of Knappagh, Diocese of Tuam.

Magee, Rev. William Percival, M.A., Incumbent of Kilmore; Incumbent of Killylea, Diocese of Armagh.

Mahon, Rev. G. E., M.A., Curate; Vicar of New Clee, Grimsby.

Mansbridge, Rev. Sydney Gilbert, M.A., Vicar of Withington; Vicar of Wicklewood, Norfolk.

Marriner, Rev. Francis, B.A., Curate; Rector of St. Ive, Liskeard.

Marson, Rev. Charles L., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Somerstown; Vicar of Hambridge, Somerset.

Mathews, Rev. W. S.; Chaplain of the Lambeth Guardians' School at Norwood.

Maule, Rev. George, Vicar of Tetsworth; Honorary R.D. Secretary for the Church Army in the Deanery of Aston, Oxford.

McKenzie, Rev. Kenneth, B.A., Curate of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Westmoreland (Mr. Charles Walker).

Merryweather, Rev. H. Hill, M.A., Curate of St. George's, Sheffield; Curate of Tintwistle, with Charge of St. Mary's, Hollingworth,

Montefiore, Rev. Durbin Brice, M.A.; Vicar of Westbury, Bucks.

Murphy, Rev. C. H., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class.

Neville, Rev. F. W. C., M.A., Vicar of Frickley, near Doncaster; Ruridecanal Secretary of the Church Army for the Rural Deanery of Wath.

Peek, Rev. Richard, M.A., Chaplain at Dinard; Rector of Drewsteignton, Devon.

Powley, Rev. A. T., M.A., Curate of Tarporley; Vicar of Shenstone, Lichfield.

Quinn, Rev. William Trevor, Curate of St. Saviour's, Bath; Rector of Coston-with-Runhall, Norfolk.

Richards, Rev. William, Perpetual Curate of Bedford Chapel, Exeter; Vicar of Newport, Barnstaple.

Risk, Rev. J. E., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's Chapel, Plymouth; Rector of Stockleigh English.

Robinson, Rev. Charles John, D.C.L.; Principal of Queen's College, Harley-street.

Robinson, Rev. John; Vicar of Edstone, Yorkshire.

Sneyd, Rev. Ralph Henry, M.A., Rector of Earsham, Norfolk; Diocesan Inspector for the Deanery of Redenhall (Eastern Division).

Stillman, Rev. W. Beaufoy, M.A., Rector of Downham Market; Acting Chaplain to the 3rd Volunteer Battalion, Norfolk Regiment.

Taylor, Rev. E.; General Licence in the Diocese of Peterborough.

Timothy, Rev. J. D., B.A., Curate of Llanfihangel-Genear-Glyn; Rector of Llangwm, Pembrokeshire.

Vaughan, Rev. Ernest Wentworth, M.A., Curate of Clewer; Rector of Maltby-in-the-Marsh, Lincolnshire.

Ward, Rev. Edwin R., Chaplain of the Northern Hospital, Winchmore-hill; Secretary of the London Diocesan Council for Preventive, Rescue, and Penitentiary Work.

Williams, Rev. F. B. A., B.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Bingley; Curate of Yeadon, Yorkshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cheese, Rev. J. A., M.A., Vicar of New Bilton, Rugby, on the 23rd ult..

Cronshey, Rev. F. J., M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Thetford, on the 29th ult.

Fellowes, Rev. William, M.A., at Mangreen Hall, Norfolk, on 1st inst., aged 74.

Hodgson, Rev. Evelyn Gisborne, M.A., S.C.L., for many years Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Ripon, at New Mill Vicarage, near Huddersfield, on February 15th, aged 48.

Mathews, Rev. Alexander Davis, M.A., Archdeacon of Mauritius, at Peveril Lodge, Moka, Mauritius, on March 23rd aged 59.

Moberly, Rev. George Herbert, Canon of Salisbury Cathedral, and Master of St. Nicholas Hospital, Salisbury, at Cintra House, Winchester, on the 30th ult., aged 58.

Pooley, Rev. John Henry, Senior Prebendary of Lincoln, and for sixty-two years Rector of Scotter, at Scotter Rectory, on the 29th ult., aged 92.

Roberts, Rev. Ellis, Rector of Llangwm, Corwen, Honorary Canon of St. Asaph, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop, on the 23rd ult., aged 69.

Russell, Rev. Harry Vane, M.A., Rector of Wem, at the Rectory Wem, Salop, on the 1st inst.

Walker, Rev. F. T., M.A., for twenty-six years Rector of Eaton Hastings, at Eaton Hastings Rectory, Berks, on the 26th ult., aged 80.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SUFFERING AND REIGNING.

By CANON CHARLES GORE, M.A.

Sermon Preached in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, April 10th, 1895, at a Mid-day Service to Business Men.

"If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him."—2 Tim. ii. 12.

At this season of the year good Christians draw near to watch the mystery of their Lord's Passion; and again and again they find themselves told in the pages of the New Testament that Christ in His Passion is not only a sacrifice for their sins, but the example for their lives. Yet Passion-tide diffuses an atmosphere of reality. As we come near the cross, as we read those most holy and most truthful records of the surroundings of our Lord's Passion, we, all of us, want to be real. The very words banish unreality. Yet how can we, being real, think of ourselves in full view of those holy sufferings as partakers of His pain? What can it mean? "If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him." Let me try in a very few minutes to give you some leading thoughts which may help you to see what is meant by our being conformed to the sufferings of our Lord. Let me ask you to notice three simple truths.

First, that our Lord's life was not all or mainly spent in suffering. There is a famous sentence in the "Imitation of Christ," in which it is said that our Lord was not for one moment of His life without the agony of His Passion. But I do not suppose that the consideration of the Gospel record would justify that pious imagination. Our Lord lived for thirty of the three-and-thirty years of His mortal life in the happiness and quietness of His home; and when He first went out on His mission to mankind there must have been some large measure of happiness that goes with being welcome. Only at the end of His life did it deepen into the darkness of suffering, and at last into anguish and the dark valley of the shadow of death.

Secondly, notice this: our Lord's life was perfectly continuous, and the sufferings which came at the end grew directly and simply out of the human principle on which He lived. There was no change in His attitude; and, setting aside the forty days' fast in the wilderness, there was not any seeking of pain. All the pain that came upon Him came out of one of two roots—the root of obedience and the root of sympathy. *The root of obedience.*—He rode out because of the word of truth, of meekness, and righteousness. "He bore witness to the supernatural truth of His mission towards the Sadducees. "Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures, neither the power of God." . . . He bore witness to the deep, vital, progressive righteousness which had found utterance in the older prophets, but full expression through the lips of the Son of Man. Before the face of the Pharisees He bore witness to the word of truth and righteousness linked by meekness. Again and again the people at large would have come and made Him a King. But the bruised reed would He not break, and the smoking flax would He not quench, nor would He cry nor cause His voice to be heard in the street; He bore witness to the word of truth and righteousness. All indignation, all opposition, all rejection, even death came simply out of that obedience to the uttermost of His mission.

Or, once more, notice this: pain came also from deliberate sympathy. Our Lord describes the life of the selfish: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone." Look at the grain of corn. It is the very symbol of a selfish life. There it is, a beautiful thing in its golden integument; but for ever, in its beauty, barren. It must give itself up to let the moisture of the ground rot that integument of its selfish life; for only so in abandoning itself can the vital principle be made to germinate within it and bring forth fruit thirty fold, sixty fold, a hundred fold. So our Lord lays before us the principle of the selfish life which He, in his own example, utterly abandons. He hid not Himself from His own flesh; He would not use the supernatural or natural powers of His position to secure advantages to Himself. He simply hid not Himself from His own flesh, but went out, not in the agony of the cross, but as He was among men. He bore their sicknesses and carried their infirmities.

You will find that the pain of our Lord came simply out of this double root of obedience and of sympathy. That is the point, then, to which I would ask your attention. He did not in the main seek pain, or draw it upon Himself. He went out into the world to be obedient to the uttermost of His mission. He went out into the world in the spirit of sympathy with the common weaknesses, and infirmities, and sins of men. And out of this obedience, out of this sympathy, came all the agonies of His Passion.

Now we can apply it. Now we see both what is meant and what is not meant, surely, by our sharing the sufferings of our Lord. It is not meant that we are to go about seeking pain. It is not meant that we are to refuse the healthy joys that life offers us. It is not meant that we should be morbid and sentimental.

It *is* meant that we should set ourselves to follow, if imperfectly, deliberately, and really, the principles of our Lord's living. First, our life must be a continuous procedure. You must have an ideal which, beginning at the beginning of the life you try to live thoughtfully for God, goes on to the end. A continuous ideal must control your life. You must go out into the world—in other words, to bear witness, and that witness, if you would be a Christian, must be a deliberate witness to the threefold mission of our Lord—a witness to truth, meekness, and righteousness.

Then, further, we see there also how we shall have to suffer, in what nature, and in what degree. Yes, we know, the world being what it is, that we cannot bear witness to truth and meekness and righteousness without suffering; and if that is the motive of our life, though we be imperfect, and not always wise, and not always brave, every pain we suffer in thought and in body will be a pain which we may thankfully recognise as uniting us truly and really to the sufferings of Jesus Christ.

We go out to bear witness to truth, meekness, and righteousness. It is not a good thing to blazon our belief; it is not a good thing to go about the world arguing our Christian creed, but instead to bear witness to truth. Do not let us be ashamed of our creed. Do not let us be ashamed of our Christian morality. We cannot carry into the world the principles of honesty and of purity without a great deal of struggling at times, and loss, real loss, of worldly advantage, and again and again alienation from ordinary society round about us in a greater or less degree. We all know it. If we will be loyal to the elemental principles of truth and morality, we shall have our measure of sufferings. We need not hunt for it, we need not go out of our way to find it; but we must expect it. God who knows and loves us will regulate that measure of suffering which He sees fit for us and which He sees we are able to bear.

Thirdly, we go out in sympathy. "Hide not thyself from thine own flesh." We may clutch at the advantage of our worldly position to screen ourselves as much as ever we can from fellowship in the pains which the great mass of men have to share. "Hide not thyself from thine own flesh." Have some contact with the suffering, and not in a general and vague philanthropy merely, but a real, actual sympathy with some suffering men or women. Have your own burden well in hand, well borne, so that you can lay open the spaces of your heart, and give some of your vacant time really to bear the burdens of others. There are some weaker than you in your office or round about you in your society, some poorer than you, some struggling with great difficulties or great temptations. Be at pains, with a manly and intelligent sympathy, to understand their difficulties, so that as you are walking on you may feel that you have been able to tide over the rough waters of this life some one or other whose case you really know; that you have been able to help through the moral difficulties and temptations all around some one whom you are drawing with you nearer to God.

These are simple things—to have an ideal, to bear witness deliberately and regularly to truth and righteousness, linked by meekness, to see to it that there are at least some one or two poorer and weaker than you whom, in intelligent sympathy, you are drawing on into smoother waters, into a better position, into a purer life, into knowledge and truth. These are elementary things; but it is in these things that will come that share which God sees good for you in the sufferings of your Lord. For all our Lord's pains, even the deepest and the most mysterious, even the pain which lay behind that tremendous cry of the Cross, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" had their root in common human virtues, the common morality of obedience and of sympathy. If you will try to live in this way, then each one may truly feel that we are having the honour incalculable of really taking part in the redemptive work of Christ; and if, for a time, you are discouraged by the filthy mass of corruption, of sin, and of wrong which is round about you in the world, take courage. What keeps the world from being worse is that there are some who are struggling to live by high principle. It is not true that your efforts are in vain. It has been said that it is when the best men stop trying that the world sinks back like lead. So, on the other hand, what keeps moral principles in the world are the efforts, the struggling, of those who are endeavouring, unostentatiously, to be really righteous. You *do* keep the whole of society leavened; you keep it from putrefaction by the salt of righteousness which is in you. So then do not despond. You contemplate the Passion, you see the greatest show of weakness which righteousness and truth ever exhibited there in the apparent failure of the cross; and you know the great secret—He rose again the third day from the dead, and the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

Let me very briefly tell you a story, a memorable one, which may be new to a few of you, but which never leaves one's memory when once it has gained a lodgment there. The story comes from the strange period of the Crusades, in which there was so strange a mixture of good and evil. You know how the Crusaders, after manifold difficulties and delays, at last succeeded in capturing the Holy City, and then proceeded to set up there in Jerusalem the Christian kingdom. They elected a king, and chose the chivalrous, the stainless, the peerless Godfrey of Bouillon. They offered him the crown; but he set it aside, saying he could not wear the crown of gold in the city where His Master had worn the crown of thorns.

Brethren, let those of us who would be real

Christians look round in the world; it is still the world of that great city where our Lord was crucified; and if we are disposed to hug ourselves in selfish ease away from the struggle and the troubles of mankind, then look steadily at that figure of Christ, and swear, in the inmost recesses of your moral being, where you swear those great oaths which through all weakness and failure really determine the courses of men's lives, that you will not wear a crown of gold in the city where your Master wore the crown of thorns.

THE GREAT HOUSE.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER.

Sermon Preached at St. Peter's Church, Hereford, on Sunday Evening, March 10th, 1895.

"Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth them that are His. And, Let everyone that nameth the Name of Christ depart from iniquity. But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and earth; and some to honour and some to dishonour."—2 Tim. ii. 19, 20.

FROM the language of this Epistle, the last the Apostle wrote, it appears that he was expecting shortly to suffer death. It was almost in the very presence of martyrdom that he wrote his second letter to Timothy, and we can trace a vein of sadness throughout it. For Paul was but human, and this overshadowing of sorrow only makes us feel the reality of his words. They are indeed the words of a dying man and the last message of a faithful friend.

Persecutions abound, and Timothy is stayed up against them with words of hope and warning. But the errors of false teaching with its necessary growth of practical ungodliness are greater perils than those of persecution, and the veteran Apostle puts his younger comrade on his guard. Hymenæus and Alexander were overthrowing the faith of some by their false teaching about the resurrection. Probably they taught that there was no resurrection but a spiritual one—from sin unto righteousness, and that therefore with Christians the resurrection was past, and there was none to come. Like a gangrene eating its way through healthy flesh, their error was spreading its corruption in the Ephesian Church. Hymenæus had already made shipwreck of the faith himself, and like too many more in later ages he was seeking now the subversion of others. Like other false teachers also, he was only too successful.

But what are we to say to these things? Amid widespread defection from the service of Christ and the truth of his Gospel, how shall we escape the contagion? May we not tremble for the Ark of God itself, when such disloyalty invades the camp? Or again, as another thought arises in our hearts, what means the presence of these evil men within the sacred circle? We thought the Church should be preserved pure, like a heaven upon earth. Why then is the divine permission given to this intermingling of error with truth, sin with holiness? and how is it that in the congregation of God's people "are found wicked men?"

St. Paul's allegory of the Great House is the answer. We are not builders, but beholders; therefore we may begin our survey with the appurtenances of the house itself, and then mark the strength and superscription of its foundations.

I. The Great House.

If men did not try to be wiser than God, they would not be seeking a pure and perfect below. Paradise is lost on earth, and it can only be found in heaven. It is only a fool's paradise that men make when they pretend to the character of undefiled purity in their assemblies here.

> There is no flock, however watched and tended,
> But one dead lamb is there.

Indeed, the Church of God has been likened well to the ark of Noah, as it floats above a watery world, containing its multitude of living creatures, the clean and the unclean.

In parable after parable did our Saviour teach that in the visible Church, as one of our Articles expresses it, "the evil be ever mingled with the good" (Art. 26), and this is the teaching of St. Paul in the text: (1) *The Church is a house.* A house is distinguished from other buildings by the fact that it is intended for a dwelling, as the word means. And every house is builded by someone, and the Maker and Builder of this house, and He that dwells therein, is God. He that laid the foundations of the world, and reared the universal frame, humbled Himself to build this house for His Name. He chose this habitation for Himself; this shall be His rest for ever, for He hath a delight therein. Never of this house, as of the temple of old, shall it be said, "Your house is left unto you desolate" for its name shall be to all generations, "The Lord is there." Let the truth be written upon our hearts that the Lord of hosts is with us, and the God of Jacob is our refuge. It should be a cause of confidence and a riddance of fear. "My Spirit dwelleth among you; fear ye not." (2) It is a *great* house, for it reaches to the ends of the earth like that Word of which it is said "The Word of God is not bound." It is a great house, for the partition-wall between Jew and Gentile is broken down for ever, and the Gospel encompasses the world. It is a great house, because all men are included in the message of mercy, and the covenant of grace is offered to all. It is a great house because of the greatness of Him that dwelleth therein—a Prince and His palace, a King upon His throne. (3) It is a *well-furnished* house. It is the Palace Beautiful, garnished with all heavenly adornings, filled with all manner of

store. The guests are here who sit at the King's table, the ministers and servants that wait upon His pleasure. And as suitable to the requirements of a great house, we behold the vessels for the Master's service—the silver flagon, the golden chalice, the culinary utensils of wood and stone. And this, St. Paul teaches us, is a picture of the Church of Christ from age to age. All we are vessels in the house of the Great King; but let us inquire of what sort we are. Now the difference between the true and false members of the Christian Church is not here as elsewhere denoted by the figure of servants who give their service to their Lord, and those who begrudge it. We must take even a lower place than this, for we are less than servants—we are but instruments, vessels, utensils; yet happy are we in such wise, if we be made meet for the Master's use. But there is a distinction of vessels and a difference between members and members of the Church. There are (A) *vessels of gold and silver* and Christians of choice and excellence. The worth of the character they bear varies like the varying value of those precious metals, but they are all holy, and the Lord hath put His Spirit upon them. They are accepted in the Beloved, they are united in life with Christ, and they bring forth the fruit of that union. Once they lay among the potsherds, but now they are as the wings of a dove, covered with silver wings and her feathers like gold. They have felt the cleansing power of the blood of Christ, and in heart and life they have chosen His separation from sin. They have purified themselves in obeying the truth through the Spirit, from the evil ways of the world, unto unfeigned love of the brethren. They know the beginnings at least of the sanctification of the truth, for they are set apart for holy service, and ready unto every good work. They are chosen vessels like the Apostle himself, and the master regards them now as meet for his own use. They can have no higher distinction, they can claim no greater reward. This, then, is to be a vessel unto honour. Let us all ask ourselves, do I answer to that character? It is a high honour to which we are called for, it is the honour that cometh from God only. The gold and silver vessels of men enrich their possessors, but in our humble service in the hand of the King it is He that enriches us, gives us our value, and makes us what we are. Are we in His hand for Him to use us as he will? Then let us give Him all the praise. Are we but *vessels*? Then surely we must confess that it is He that hath made us and not we ourselves, he who hath created us anew in Christ Jesus unto good works. Here is motive for *humility*. Are we *vessels*? Then we have nothing that we did not receive and should not glory as though we had not received it. To whom shall we refer the disparity between our brethren's gifts and our own? To ourselves?—nay, but to the good pleasure of God. Here is a strong incentive to the deepest *gratitude*. Again, are we *vessels*? Then as the vessel pours out its contents, so must we live for the benefit and blessing of others and thus for the glory of God. Here is encouragement to earnest *activity*.

Such, then, are the vessels of mercy, and so it is done unto them, whom the King delighteth to honour. But there are (B) *other vessels in the King's house, vessels of wood and earth, vessels unto dishonour*. And such are the false teachers and evil livers in the Church of God, barren professors of religion, Christians only in name, who know but the outward call of the Gospel. With a name to live they are dead, denying by their works what in words they profess. They are the menial vessels of the household, and they can never be brought into the King's presence. They are unfit for His use; they are hirelings in the home, and their day will come to depart, not sons that abide therein for ever. Many a man far away at Tyre contributed to the building of the Jewish Temple; only God's own people entered therein. Like sinful Israel and Moab, these mere professors are "vessels wherein is no pleasure." Yet they serve their purpose. They may be persecuting Sauls even while professing obedience to the Holy One of Israel; but they knit the hearts of the faithful more and more to their ever-present Lord. Their hand may support the ministry of a Gospel which their heart has never accepted. Their moral influence may lead their neighbours on the way back to God, while they are still estranged from Him in unforgiveness and sin. They may help to train up their children in the way they should go, though they make that an excuse for not following that way themselves. Thus the unspiritual and the unrenewed serve a purpose, but not for their own honour. They may stand like the water-pots of stone at the wedding at Cana, but not in them will the wine be presented to the Ruler of the Gospel feast. God will not use them, God cannot use them as they are, because they are not made meet for the Master's use; and we take up for them God's lamentation for one of the last of Judah's kings: "Is this man Coniah a despised, broken vessel? Is he a vessel wherein is no pleasure?" Unlike the chosen vessels of grace they miss the honour of the divine communion, the joy of God's royal presence, the blessing of the feast of love, and know not the experience promised by the Lord Jesus to His people: "If a man love Me, he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and We will come unto him, and make Our abode with him" (John xiv. 23). Nay, there is a worse degradation still than that implied in vessels of menial service. We throw not away our gold and silver vessels; indeed their value sometimes increases with their age; and thus, to speak after the manner of men, the beloved of the Lord grow dearer and dearer unto Him as a peculiar treasure. But the vessels of dishonour are at last marred, broken,

and cast out; and the ungodly, that repent not that they may be saved, prove themselves at last vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. They are like the savourless salt and the chaff of the winnowing floor, broken vessels of a God-forgetting careless, sinful life, meet for perpetual dishonour and everlasting shame.

We have noticed the outward aspect, now let us consider briefly the inward character of the Church represented as—

II. The Firm Foundation.*

But there is a refuge from this dire contingency we have spoken of as betiding the impenitent, and for the believer there is abundant comfort in the midst of prevailing unfaithfulness and apostate profession. "The firm foundation of God standeth." Men's faith may fail, but God's foundation abideth. God's house is built upon a rock. The wall of Zion's city had in its twelve foundations the names of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb, and the foundation of the house of Christ's Church is doubly sealed with His own Name. "The Name of the Lord is a strong tower," and herein lies our foundation's strength and our faith's stability. His Name is sealed for our safety: "We are called by Thy Name; leave us not."

1. It is the seal of *consolation*. "The Lord knoweth them that are His." Thus had God spoken long before, when, on a notable occasion, He vindicated the official character and authority of Moses and Aaron. "The Lord will show who are His and who is holy, and will cause him to come near unto Him, even him whom He hath chosen" (Num. xvi. 5). The day is coming when the prophet's word shall be fulfilled: "Ye shall return to discern between the righteous and the wicked" (Mal. iii. 18). It has, indeed, its measure of fulfilment now, but that other saying is true: "The world knoweth us not because it knew Him not" (1 John iii. 1). The manifestation of the sons of God is a future event; at present our "life is hid with Christ in God." But if men do not recognise the lineaments of grace, the Author of grace does. Nathanail, as Hooker says, was only an Israelite to his countrymen, but he was "an Israelite indeed in whom was no guile" to his Saviour, for Christ is the Good Shepherd, and He knows His sheep even before He is known by them. Brethren, can you make your appeal to Him and say, "Thou knowest that I love Thee; Thou knowest that I am Thine." Herein, then, you have infinite consolation and endless joy. Indeed, God's knowledge of us is a better refuge than our knowledge of Him (Gal. iv. 9). To fear God's knowledge of us shows that our knowledge of Him has profited us little. "God knows," or "Heaven knows," is a careless saying of multitudes who have never seriously weighed its awful meaning. "God knows" should mean to us a confessed conscience and a clean heart, a childlike trust in our heavenly Father, a mind at one with Jesus, a life lived in the Holy Spirit's communion and in the light of life.

Though lost I seem 'mid crowds unknown,
Jesus knows;
He sees and marks me for His own,
Jesus knows.
I pasture 'neath the Shepherd's eye,
In sunshine of His love I lie,
And while He lives I cannot die,
Jesus knows.

2. But the seal has also its *warning and exhortation*. "Let everyone that nameth the Name of Christ depart from iniquity." This is our part of the seal, as the other is God's. The consolation will not profit us if the warning is lost upon us. An appeal to our life is as necessary as an appeal to our Lord. "Why call ye Me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" His Name on our lips condemns us if that Name is not written in fair characters upon our life. He that said He would show who were His and who were holy commanded the congregation of Israel to depart from the tents of those wicked men (Num. xvi. 26). The name of Christ, the name of the Lord, stands for righteousness, holiness, truth, goodness. The naming of that name is the profession of the faith of the Crucified One, the worship of Him who came to destroy sin, the taking hold of the covenant that pledges us to whole-hearted sanctification of life. Let this seal, then—the Lord's own seal—be ever before our eyes, that we may walk in His truth, which is that we be separate from every manner of sin as an unclean thing, from every teaching of heresy as the error of the Wicked One, from every form of unrighteousness as the ruin of the soul. Then the day of our humiliation shall never come, but when the vessels of dishonour shall be cast out for ever, we shall be preferred to eternal glory in the court of our King, the Lord Jesus Christ, the true Solomon, in whose palace, as nothing to be accounted of in those days, all the vessels shall be of pure gold, and every one shall be, in his royal presence, "holiness unto the Lord."

* See Bishop Ellicott's "Critical Commentary," *in loco*.

An advertisement appeared in the daily papers last week from "the Church Vigilance Committee." It invites information concerning the marriage of divorced persons in church, both of such marriages performed anywhere in England during the last five years, and of such marriages as are known to be purposed. All communications, it is added, will be treated as confidential.

The Re-union Conference at Grindelwald this summer will be attended by the new Dean of Ripon, Mr. Fremantle, by the Archdeacon of Manchester, Mr. Wilson, and possibly by other and more representative Churchmen. The Moderator of the Church of Scotland and several other Presbyterian and Dissenting dignitaries will also be present. Mr. Athelstan Riley is expected to take part in a discussion on religious teaching in elementary schools.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 18, 1895.

THE WELSH DISESTABLISHMENT BILL.

THE Committee stage of the Welsh Disestablishment Bill has already produced results of interest. In the first place it has effectually disposed of the favourite Liberationist argument, the only one with any show of truth—"Religious Equality." It is conceivable that Nonconformists may feel piqued at what appear to be the privileges of Establishment; it is certain that the clergy chafe under its burdens, for instance, such legal profanation of both church and liturgy as that which lately took place at St Mark's, North Audley Street. A measure for Disestablishment pure and simple might have a *primâ facie* justification under the plea of liberty and equality. And it was therefore a most sensible suggestion that the Bill should be divided, and Disestablishment treated separately from Disendowment. It does not follow that, thus divided, the Bill would have been any more acceptable to Churchmen. But it would have at least proved the sincerity of the motives of the Government, and shown that they were seeking the equality of which they speak so much. The Government, however, opposed the instruction, and secured its rejection, and, by so doing, have given themselves away as champions of freedom and equality. By refusing even to contemplate Disestablishment apart from Disendowment, they have shown that the latter is what they really seek, and that a free, though unprivileged Church is quite as repugnant to them as the Church in its present state. They aim at robbery, not reform. Of course this is what we have always been saying, but it is as well to have it out of the mouths of our adversaries. And this makes it all the more certain that the attack in Wales will soon become the attack in England. For, supposing the case of Establishment were different in the two places, and that is what they tell us, there is no difference in the case of Endowment. If it is right to take the Welsh endowments, it must be right to take the English, and it certainly would be much more profitable. If anything were needed to quicken the senses of Churchmen to their real danger it is this hoisting of the black flag, this plain indication that the possessions, rather than the privileges, of the Church are aimed at by her enemies.

The Committee stage has also disposed of the local arguments for the Bill. The argument from local opinion goes first. It was proposed to except from the Bill a certain portion of Pembrokeshire, the inhabitants of which are dead against it. This was refused on the ground that local feeling is not a proper ground for action under the circumstances. And yet the whole Bill is based upon the local feeling in Wales, which, we are assured, demands it. Upon this reasoning when are we, and when are we not, to regard local feeling? It must be regarded in Wales, but not in parts of Wales. Then it ought to be in England, and yet not in parts of England. But here again we stumble, for Wales is certainly geographically a part of England, as much as Pembrokeshire is a part of Wales. The only clue we have, then, is that local feeling must be regarded when it is in favour of the Government, but not otherwise. Which is, in reality, very near the truth.

Next goes what may be called the geographical, or rather topographical, argument—that drawn from local boundaries. Wales, we are told, being a distinct entity, desires this Bill, and therefore she must have it. But the Bill also applies to Monmouth, which is not a part of Wales. For ecclesiastical purposes it was added to the diocese of Llandaff, and therefore, though geographically English, it is ecclesiastically Welsh. But a precisely opposite reasoning is applied to certain parts of the diocese of Hereford which, though ecclesiastically English, are geographically Welsh, and, therefore, also come under the provisions of the Bill. The immortal Dogberry alone could do justice to such arguments, which recall Fluellyn and his famous parallel between Macedon and Monmouth; they are an insult to common sense.

How long the Committee stage will continue is uncertain. Probably not long. It is obvious that the closure must be resorted to, and as soon as a decent interval has elapsed, for there is no possibility of amendment or compromise. The line taken by the defenders of the Church is clear. As long as opportunity offers they must continue to expose, not alone the iniquities of the Bill, but the insincerity of its promoters, the dishonesty of their motives, and the fallacious character of their arguments. This is a case in which defence is

virtually attack, and the defenders have all the advantage which generally goes to the attacking party. That advantage must be used to the full—by carrying the war into the enemy's country and making the strongholds of dissent centres of active Church defence proceedings. In some Welsh towns this has already been done with wonderful success. Meetings have been held, and a most favourable impression produced in places where no voice has been raised in public on behalf of the Church for many years. The more this is done, and the more the fairer-minded, even of our enemies, are brought to consider the question in its true bearings, the less the Church will have to hear from men who cut the sorry figure which is now being displayed in Parliament.

CHURCH NOTES.

LORD SELBORNE'S death is lamented by all classes of Churchmen. He was a typical specimen of the best form of Anglican Churchmanship, devout without being fanatical, steadfastly attached to his own principles, without any bitterness towards opponents. There can be little doubt as to his successor in the chair of the House of Laymen. The position belongs almost as of right to Mr. George Spottiswoode. It will be a matter of greater difficulty to replace Mr. Spottiswoode in the Vice-Presidency. Several men are well fitted for the post, but there is no one with the pre-eminent qualifications of the present holder.

Chancellor Tristram's law as to the right of objecting to a marriage when the ceremony is actually going on is by no means generally accepted. The *Guardian* asks what is the duty of a man who strolls into a church while a marriage is going on and sees a man, whom he knows to have a wife already, about to marry another woman, or a woman, whom he knows to be the sister of the bridegroom's late wife, about to marry her brother-in-law? Is he to allow the ceremony to go on because there is no time to communicate his objection to the Chancellor through the Registrar?

Another point of great importance is mentioned by a correspondent of the same paper. It has been the custom of the Consistory Court of London to issue licenses for the marriage of persons whose marriage has been dissolved by a foreign court of competent jurisdiction. This has been qualified by reading into it the additional words, "on grounds recognised by English law." Apparently, however, Chancellor Tristram is content with the grounds recognised by the law of any foreign country, and in that case, as the *Guardian* remarks, the full laxity of American divorce has been introduced into England by a side wind.

It seems possible that the absurd story which has been published in the Italian papers that the Archbishop of Canterbury has been exhorting English Protestants to pray for union with Rome is a distorted version of the letter which the Primate has just addressed to his own diocese, requesting that the prayer for unity should be said on Whitsun Day. This is not the first, but the second, occasion on which the Archbishop has made this proposal, and he invites Nonconformists to fall in with it. We believe that last year a good many did so, and probably at least as many will do so again.

Practical, if not theoretical, re-union is favoured by the Bishop of Newcastle. There was lately a great gathering of Presbyterians in his cathedral city, and Dr. Wilberforce was invited. He promised to be present if he was not in London at the time. As a matter of fact he was not able to keep his promise, but in his answer to the invitation he wrote:—"Of course I should speak, if at all, as a strong Churchman, holding firmly to my own convictions, and yet able to sympathise with all who, holding to their convictions, can work, and teach, and practise, with Christian charity to those who differ from them."

The Bishop of Winchester has written to Mr. Chamberlain, expressing his wish to be a contributor to the memorial to the late Dr. Dale, of Birmingham. In his letter, Dr. Thorold says:—"I consider him (Dr. Dale) to have been one of the most enlightened and profound theologians of our time. My shelves contain nearly all, if not all, his books, and we were friends. Some of his letters I cherish as treasures."

The announcement that the income of the oldest missionary society of the Church, the S.P.G., was better last year than in 1893 by more than £9,000 (the total was £122,329) is satisfactory. But the satisfaction is qualified by the statement that the increase is chiefly due to legacies. That is a most uncertain element of revenue. It is to be hoped that the efforts of the junior clergy, as they are called, to popularise the society's claims and work, to which the Archbishop referred with approval at the annual meeting, will result in a large addition to more trustworthy sources of income.

Another Christian Socialist has found favour with the administrators of Royal patronage, and been presented to a Crown living. The fortunate cleric is the Rev. C. L Marson, of St. Mary's, Somers Town, and he has been appointed to succeed the late Rev. C. S. Grueber at Hambridge, in Somerset. Mr. Marson has done some work as a journalist. He wrote for the *Pall Mall Gazette* when that paper was in Radical hands, and has more recently contributed to the *Saturday Review*. The living of Hambridge is not a fat one, but there is little to do, the population being under 600.

The new Canon of Westminster, the Rev. Robert Eyton, desires to have it known that he does not gain pecuniarily by giving up his Chelsea rectory. Only very ignorant people could have supposed that he did. It is of more interest to know that Canon Eyton does not oppose the principle of endowments for religious purposes, and that he is in favour of what is called concurrent endowment. He is not, as has been stated, a member of the Liberal Churchmen's Union.

Prebendary Webb-Peploe has announced to his congregation at St. Paul's, Onslow Square, that, in accordance with the wishes of a considerable majority, he will in future preach in the surplice instead of the gown. He holds that, as the dress of the preacher has never been regulated by law, "it is unwise to retain in our Church a dress which only excites discussion, and appears to offend, at the very time when we are seeking to win men's hearts." With Mr. Webb-Peploe's change the last black gown disappears from the rural deanery of Kensington.

A difficulty as to preaching garb was lately encoun-

tered by the Bishop of Wakefield, who has been touring in Jersey. One day he had to preach at one of the island churches, but he had left his episcopal robes behind him. He put on a surplice, however, and went into the pulpit, and (he tells the story himself in his *Diocesan Magazine*) in two minutes quite forgot what was lacking "But to this hour," he adds, "I am not quite sure that some of the congregation did not look on me as an impostor. The worst is yet to come. Confiding my experience of the morning to a young lady, whom I met shortly afterwards, her reply, while in a sense reassuring, also taught me what I ought not to have needed to learn —never to volunteer an explanation unless it is clear it is wanted She had never seen a Bishop's dress in her life, and had no idea what it was like."

If Dr. Walsham How was insufficiently habited, Dean Farrar the other night found himself too abundantly clothed. He was preaching at St Bride's, Fleet Street, for the Church of England Young Men's Society, and (according to a correspondent of the *Record*) found his hood an incumbrance, so he took it off and laid it upon the pulpit.

Still apropos of vestments. The vicar of Exwyton told his people in his *Parish Magazine* that he was going to use a new cope for the first time on Easter Sunday, and took the opportunity of stating in plain and simple terms the use and significance of the vestment, winding up by stating that it was covered by the Ornaments Rubric. He added that whoever would like to see it closely might do so in the vestry at stated times. Mrs. Pottles was one of those who went, and, on being asked what she thought of it, replied that it was very nice, but that she was somewhat disappointed, for it was only of white satin, and was not covered with the Ornaments Rubric at all. "Peter Lombard" assures the readers of the *Church Times* of the truth of this anecdote.

According to a local correspondent, the custom of having surpliced choirs of ladies is beginning to spread in the North. Ebchester Parish Church began, and now its example has been followed by Christ Church, Newcastle-on-Tyne. We are sorry to hear it. If women are to sing in Church choirs at all, it is far better that they should be dressed as women ordinarily are—as neatly and quietly as may be, of course —than figure in vestments for which there is no authority or precedent, and which easily lend themselves to ridicule.

THINGS IN GENERAL.

The Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., stated :—

One of the most certain facts with which we are acquainted is that all phenomena are parts and manifestations of a vast and an intricate problem, a problem which is so definite in particulars that every person may say, as did Sir Thomas Brown in "Religio Medici," "His life has been a continual miracle, which to relate were not a history, but a piece of poetry, and would sound like a fable."

The advance of science shows that the worlds, the things in them, and all life were made and continue by expenditure of force. This expenditure is not reckless and purposeless, but guided and restrained. Every force, as it is used, passes into or becomes some other force ; no part of it is wasted. The forces, after some certain gradations, pass into heat ; the heat, diffused in space, is not lost, but enters other uses of which we know very little. The directive and restraining power, which turns all expended force into further use, is called "conservation of energy." It suggests, as Matthew Arnold said, "One mighty wave of thought and joy lifting mankind amain" ("A Song of Regret").

As to things in general, we look at the railway engines, carriages, telegraph wires, signal-boxes, and feel sure they are more in analogy with our intelligence than with the coals that heat the boiler and generate the steam. Our eye, its retina, all the nerves, telegraphing to the brain to awake sensation, thought, emotion, are not wholly by insensate atoms, but make visible some invisible Will vastly more intelligent than our own. They speak not only to the head, making us a little wiser, but to the heart, also making us better ; and we press on till the breeze, the rain, and the sun-lit fields quicken our souls, as by a God-given sermon, to "freshness of the early world."

Can we suppose the beautiful objects in general were so low an order of things once as to have been in no order, a sort of nothing at all? and that out of this, little by little, were advances without definite beginning, but somehow the whole grew into the beautiful present, and the present will advance into a more wonderful future? We cannot so suppose, and if we could suppose, that would not be science. Nature is like our own words, and they, we know, half reveal and half conceal the soul within, for indeed there is a soul within.

Of course science means knowledge, and we must not call guess-work knowledge. To exclude mind from things in general, though only by mind we know them, is to set at nought that by which we know. Our consciousness of effort when we act yields an undeniable conviction that power is the true creator and true connection between cause and effect. We have no difficulty as to knowing this power behind nature. If we did not know something of it, we could not say "There is the power." Knowing, we will not go with David Hume to awake doubts by a sort of philosophy which raises the devil of unbelief, and then falls down to worship him. For our own part, we say—The love of nature, as the work of heaven, makes us heavenly. In that beautiful transformation we attain the highest wisdom, for to be greatly wise is to be greatly good Then we image that God who, perfect in wisdom and in goodness, makes daily duties a part of our religious life. Christ, becoming a child and growing into manhood, blesses all little children, and makes the faithful man's heart pure and his life to be holy.

THOUGHTS ON THE SACRIFICES, THE PASSOVER, AND THE SACRAMENTS.

Followed by a Question, Was the Mosaic Passover Eaten A.D. 33?

God speaks of things that are not as if they were, and inspires His servants, patriarchs, and prophets to speak of things to come as if they realised them.

God, foreknowing the world would fall, planned, in union with the Holy Spirit, the Son volunteering, that

Jesus Christ should be the Saviour of the world—the Lamb to be sacrificed. May we not, therefore, say the Sacraments existed before all time?

It is, I think, always accepted, by God clothing Adam and Eve with skins, that He had taught them, as far as they could understand, that sacrifice was to be the type of Jesus Christ, and therefore of the Last Supper. And when we read of the Mosaic sacrifices combined with ablutions, may we not herein see the type of baptism? and if ablutions were so much used in the Mosaic ritual, it cannot be wrong to suppose ablutions were used in the first sacrifice.

Adam and Eve, it would seem, must have been so stunned by the fall that they could not understand the mysteries by which they were surrounded, and therefore they failed to bring up their children in the knowledge of what they had lost and of the salvation to come. The world kept falling away from God till He could bear it no longer; so He passed the world under the baptism of a universal Deluge. St. Clement, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, calls the Deluge "regeneration."

The righteous Noah, by his obedience, brought blessings on himself and sons, and God promised him that this universal Deluge should not be repeated, and set His bow in the cloud as the confirmation of it.

We now enter upon the second stage of sacramental power or knowledge, though we do not find that the people, who passed through the Red Sea and were in the cloud, knew what it meant. Neither should we, unless St. Paul had taught us; and being only Israelites who thus were baptised, we see that it was the baptism of a nation, and with it came increased responsibilities with their knowledge of the Commandments and laws. No other nation was ever so baptised, and this cannot be repeated any more than the Deluge. And with this baptism the nation had to content itself till the personal baptism was instituted by Christ, when He gave His command to His disciples to go into all the world and baptise. But it was not a deluge of a baptism for the world, or even as a nation, but of individuals as persons. Thus all who would be certain of salvation must prove themselves obedient by coming to holy baptism.

God dealt in a similar way of development in the case of Achan: (1) his world, the tribe of Judah, was taken; (2) his nation, the Zarhites; (3) in his individuality, the family of Zabdi.

Again, tracing the dealings of God with the world and its people under the second Sacrament, we may see a like progression.

The rite of sacrifice under Noah, we may believe, was as perfect as it could be—*i.e.*, as perfect as a type can be—and being a type was not clearly understood by the family, and as it increased less and less so, as shown by the building of the Tower and the confusion that followed; but the knowledge of a necessity of sacrifice was still retained, as shown to this day even by African "customs," Buddhism, of course, being a sort of reaction against the perversion of sacrifice which was around it.

Within this period of common or universal sacrifice Abram was permitted a vision, for he had refused to take part in the perverted idolatrous sacrifices of his people. God called him out of Chaldee, and He told him to take his son, his only son, and to offer him upon Mount Moriah. What his feelings and thoughts may have been cannot easily be described. He obeyed, and he saw Christ's day and was glad; he saw the triumph of the sacrifice on the Cross, and in receiving Isaac back from death, he learned the whole history of the redemption of the world; and in all this he learned in some mysterious way the lesson of personal obedience, and by the sacrifice of Christ that each person will be drawn to Him.

The chosen people afterwards, as a nation, were further enlightened and taught that by faithful obedience to the Passover the nation would be saved, and was saved. The Passover institution belonged alone to the people of Israel, and was therefore a national sacrament.

We have progressed further in knowledge and understanding by Christ's institution of the higher and true sacraments unfolded to us—the gift of Himself. It is now no longer an irresponsible universal, nor even a national mode of saving, but a personal seeking for salvation, that each one may be united in Christ, and made one with Him. God the Father expects each person to work for Him, in the power of the Spirit and for the love of the Son. So man shall be saved if he faithfully partakes of the holy Eucharist; and we see, in the great wish of many who have never been communicants in health, under the fear of death, on their dying beds, a seeking for consolation in that holy rite—we see in this an inherent or instructive tribute to this truth.

The development of sacramental knowledge and power and value may be shown thus:—

B.C. of baptism—

1. The universal Deluge regenerated the world.
2. The baptism of Moses regenerated the nation.
3. The baptism of Jesus regenerates the person.

Also of the Lord's Supper in sacrifice—

1. Sacrifice general from Adam to Moses was for the world—universal.
2. Sacrifice of the Passover, for the nation.
3. The sacrifice of Christ, for the person.

In all this we see how all things centre in Christ, and from Him all things are renewed and, so to speak, begin afresh. All things are double one against another. So the types taught man to look onwards to Christ, as now the commemoration and the continuation of the sacrament of Christ teaches us to look backwards to Christ on the Cross. Let us, then, see if the two sacraments, generally necessary to salvation, do not derive their value and force from Christ, starting from the Upper Chamber, so far as we personally are concerned.

Jesus Christ gives orders to two of His disciples to go into the city: "There shall a man meet you bearing a pitcher of water." The note in the "Speaker's Commentary," quoting from Godet, is not satisfactory to me. It may be perfectly true, but it seems to me as one of the Rabbinical traditions. It says this water was used for making the unleavened bread. No doubt it was in part so used. But I do not find any mention of water in the making of bread. Oil is mentioned (Lev. xxiii. 13), for example Water is often mentioned in connection with ablutions, and this seems to me the real use for the quantity of water; for, supper being ended, Jesus washes the feet of His disciples, without which they would have no part with Him. It had, no doubt, a spiritual meaning for the followers of Christ, that they must keep themselves unspotted from the world, and thus by an Apostolic succession the effect of this mysterious baptism in Christ is handed down through all generations to us; and this having taken

place at the Last Supper, shows the two sacraments to be necessary to salvation.

There are other mystical washings (1 John i. 7) by the blood of Christ, and by the Spirit (1 Cor. vi. 11).

The three that bear record in heaven.

The sacrament of baptism is personal, as in the case of Jesus at Jordan, which confirmed the value and necessity of the rite, and caused Him with His own hand to baptise the Apostles.

Lastly, for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Jesus took bread, etc., and gave it to each one of His disciples, showing the Eucharist is not a universal or national, but personal rite. However much a man may belong to the world or the nation, if he wishes to apply the healing balm to his soul, he must apply it himself. As the Israelite bitten by the serpent was healed by his looking to the serpent upon the pole, no one could look for him. As Job says, speaking of his Redeemer, "Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another." Is it not very sad to think of the thousands who are careful to apply the carnal materials to the health of their bodies, and so carefully eat their way to the grave, are not careful to apply the healing elements to their souls, and by the Divine and spiritual food eat their way to life and heaven?

Now I wish to ask about the Passover Mosaic. Was it offered at all A.D. 33?

We have booklets, etc., by the score on the last scenes and words of the Cross, in which I think, for the most part, the humanity of Christ is the prominent idea—*e.g.*, "I thirst," is looked upon as his bodily thirst, and so associated with gall and vinegar—and the It is finished as the end of His early career. All this is true, but only in part. He thirsted after the souls of men, and did not say, "I have finished," but "It is finished." Was not the "It" the covenant, the compact entered into by God and the Spirit, that Jesus should be the conqueror of death; that the types were now all ended, and that a new covenant had begun, and therefore no Mosaic Passover was offered A.D. 33, because the true Paschal Lamb was offered by Christ in His own person on the Cross? The description of all the events that happened on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday are very difficult to arrange. How's Commentary on St. Matthew xxvi. 17, 19, is very interesting, but does not touch my point. The Jewish priests and people under them had been so anxious to get our Lord condemned and betrayed, that it is not unreasonable to suppose they must have neglected or omitted many of the preparations necessary for the Passover. Hindered possibly, probably, that they might not offer it, for how could the type avail when the true Lamb was being offered? The old order was to give place to the new. The anxieties of the 13th and 14th must have been intense. Judas had assented to betray his Master. Would he succeed? He did succeed. Jesus is brought to trial before the High Priest and Pilate and Herod and back again. It is with difficulty that Pilate is taunted to pass sentence on the Just Man. At last he does, and for the moment the priests and people seem to have succeeded—Christ is crucified. But now follow portents that must have terrified the priests into forgetfulness; there was darkness over the land of Judæa from the sixth to the ninth hour. What was it? Was it a doubtful eclipse? I imagine to the disciples it was but a gray, dim religious light, inspiring no terror; but to the Jew it was a horrible darkness, and filled them with embarrassment. Then there was the earthquak and people rising out of their tombs, the rending of the vail. All these, combined with the trials, etc., must have absolutely hindered the Mosaic Passover from being offered. Anxieties did not cease with the death of Christ. His body was taken down from the Cross and buried. Would that deceiver rise again? The priests had sealed the tomb and set the watch; but very early in the morning the news is brought—He had risen. 15th. The priests were occupied in accounting for the Resurrection in bribing the guards, in protecting the guards from being tried for sleeping at their posts. When we think of the hurry of all these scenes, is it unreasonable to suppose no Mosaic Passover was offered?

Note these interesting points. With the institution of the Mosaic Passover the date of the year was changed. It was a bloody sacrifice, and the bread was not eaten *because of urgency*. The Lord instituted His Passover, (as Farrar says vol ii. 277, of a quasi-Paschal character); it was unbloody and the bread was eaten. Thus it may be thought the bloody sacrifice was not eaten *because of urgency* in the desire to slay the True Lamb, and the day of the week was changed in honour of Him.

If, amongst other things, the exact spot of Calvary is not now known, is it to be wondered the effect of the darkness was not related, or the inscriptions on the Cross being recorded differently by each Evangelist? Does not all this show many events were so well known they needed no accurate detail?

What a blank must have hung over every Passover offered from then, to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, after which only an empty ceremony can be gone through, and without even a lamb. There is no altar; the Mosaic sacrifice has ceased.

The return now to Christ is a personal matter until God specially chooses otherwise. All who seek Christ shall find Him.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." May, 1895. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

In an able and interesting paper on "Modern Religion and Old Testament Immortality," Professor A. B. Davidson makes three suggestions on the absence of the idea of immortality from the larger part of the Old Testament. First, man hardly considered himself then as an individual at all; he was one of a nation, of a clan, or at any rate of a family; he died, but *that* lived on. Secondly, the sense of the nearness of God was far stronger. Man did not live in the belief—often merely nominal—of a God who lived in a far-off, distant heaven; he believed in a present and very near God, and that was sufficient. And, thirdly, the inequalities and the apparent injustice of the world did not then strike men. It was felt that this world was well with the righteous, and that the sinner was punished; in other words, the need of another world to put this world right was not felt. On this we would make two remarks. Surely, if the idea of immortality was so absent as modern writers say it was, then the true "Ages of Faith" were those ages. We doubt if the faith—such as it is—of nineteenth century Christianity would survive the loss of its heaven and hell. And, secondly, if the idea of immortality only arose in the post-Exilic period, then what the Higher Criticism calls the Priest Code again has much to say for

itself. It was in the days of that much-abused document, and in the days when those much-abused people, the priests, were in power, and when Ezra the Scribe and his followers taught, that the idea of immortality arose.

Professor Orr's paper on "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church" makes us cross in one respect—the paper should have been fuller. The very able sketch of the Clementine literature and of the Gnostic theories is too much of a sketch; but it does suggest one or two thoughts. How old are modern controversies! The difficulties of the last decade of the nineteenth century were felt—perhaps more felt—in the second century. And the answers are much the same, at any rate, those that are more than merely temporary. Tertullian's answer to Marcion, that there is organic growth, and that there are stages of development in revelation, is still the best answer. And again, what a mistake it is to label a set of opinions heresy, and then contemptuously dismiss them. Gnosticism, of course, is heresy, but a careful study of Gnosticism in all its developments would well repay the trouble.

Professor Ramsay shows us that διέρχομαι is the proper term for *missionary* travels in the Acts; when mere travel is meant, this verb is not used.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." May, 1895. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

MR. HEADLAM continues his papers on "The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans." We draw attention to them; any one *teaching* that very difficult epistle will find them of great value.

Mr. W. St. Chad Boscawen's paper on "The Laws of the Family" contains an account of the position of women in Chaldæa, and indeed throughout the whole of the Semitic race. It is full of interest, and throws much light on many passages of the Old Testament.

Mr. Ford's Sermonettes are very good indeed.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

SIR,—Some of your readers may like to be reminded of Lord Shaftesbury's views on the opium question. His words (taken from Mr. Hodder's interesting "Life") will be found to furnish, by anticipation, a useful and instructive commentary on the official report just issued.

Almost immediately after the close of the iniquitous Opium War, under the date of March 15th, 1843, he writes: "Gave notice last night of a motion on the opium monopoly. I did it with fear, anxiety, and trembling. I shrink from the task, I dread the preparation, I quail before the execution of it. Yet it is in the cause of Christianity and of God. I have not sought it; the thing has been forced upon me, and I have not dared to refuse my labour in the cause. A deputation from several merchants made the request. A confidential officer of the Board of Trade assured me of his assistance and of the desire of the Government (privately) to receive an impulse. When I reflected on the enormous mischief and the enormous sin, I could not say 'No.'"

Some days later he adds: "Oh, what a question is this opium affair! Bad as I thought it, I find it a thousand times worse, more black, more cruel, more Satanic than all the deeds of private sin in the records of prison history."

On Tuesday, April 4th, 1843, Lord Shaftesbury (then known as Lord Ashley) brought forward his motion in the House of Commons—"That . . . the continuance of the trade in opium, and the monopoly of its growth in the territories of British India are . . . . . utterly inconsistent with the honour and duties of a Christian kingdom," etc. "If there be," said he in his speech, "any guilt in the system . . . . . it is shared by the Legislature and the whole nation; it is shared by the members of this House, which, in the year 1832, sanctioned by a law the revenue derived from the opium trade, commending the production of the drug, and actually approving its destination." Since these words were spoken, the House of Commons—only a year or two ago—has declared that the opium traffic is morally indefensible.

In his account of the debate, written the following day, Lord Shaftesbury says: "Ministers wished to avoid speaking, and called on me early to close the debate. I refused to do so. . . . . Peel was forced to rise at last. . . . . He sneered at our care for the health and morals of the Chinese, and altogether assumed the tone of a low mercantile, financial soul, incapable of conceiving or urging a principle, which finally disgusted me, and placed him in my mind much below the Christian level, and not any higher than the heathen. But as he stated that the negotiations on foot by the Government would be really impeded by such a motion as mine, I of course withdrew it. His speech was shallow and feeble. . . . . Very remarkable, not one person even attempted to touch the morality of the question; that seemed to be tacitly but universally surrendered."

In 1880 Lord Shaftesbury became the president of the Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade. "Both in and out of Parliament he used every endeavour to influence public opinion . . . . and to this end he spoke at a great meeting at the Mansion House on the 21st of October, 1881, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor; and it was lamentable that in 1881 he had to use the same arguments he had brought forward in 1843. He did not live to see the evil abated; but to the end of his life he did not cease to declare that it was 'the duty of all religious societies, and the duty of every missionary society, the duty of every man who cares for the faith of Christianity, and the duty of everyone who cares for the honour of his country, to combine in protesting, in memorialising, in giving no rest to the authorities of this country, until such time as they shall have wiped out this foul reproach from the forehead of the British Empire.'"

And so say I, and many others also who think that the official defence of wrong-doing is not only worthless, but mischievous. Sir Joseph Pease is right in repudiating the report, because it was compiled by a Commission framed by the Indian Government, which itself was on its trial. The appointment of the Commission—not desired by those who cannot but condemn the traffic—was a political manœuvre utilised to defend the indefensible. There is ample and incontrovertible evidence, by conscientious eye-witnesses of many years' experience, as to the deadly and degrading

effects of the drug. What can possibly annihilate this? "Nothing," as Mr. Gladstone says, "can annihilate a fact." The most you can do with a stubborn, inconvenient, disagreeable fact is to ignore it; you cannot by any possibility annihilate it. No amount of official plausibilities or platitudes will wipe out that convincing testimony, which has been published far and wide. There it stands, and there it ever will stand, till all right-minded persons who think that the conscience of Christian England is worth more even than three million pounds sterling per annum, rise up and unite to sweep away this crying evil.

H. HEBER EVANS.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—The Saviour lifted up. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up" (John iii. 14). Introduction.—We notice in the words of our text a plain declaration of an historical occurrence in the far centuries back by the Great Teacher. We notice three things in connection with our text:—1. An interesting incident. Through the murmuring of the children of Israel in their journeyings, God sent fiery serpents among them, and many died. Murmuring against God is sin, and demands punishment. But in judgment God remembered mercy; He commanded Moses to make a brazen serpent and put it upon a pole. On this the people were told to look, and those who looked were saved from death. 2. A striking allegory. The sending of the serpents was a type of the punishment of sin, the raising of the brazen figure was a type of the Crucifixion of Christ, and the means of safety provided for the people a type of the method of salvation provided for all. "Look and live."

"Forgive them, O My Father,
They know not what they do."
The Saviour spake in anguish,
As the sharp nails went through.

3. An urgent application. To ourselves, brethren, comes the cry, "Look." How sad it is that we should require to be so constantly urged to fall down in penitence before the Saviour; but so it is. How many times have you been called upon to believe and repent? To-day you are again called to accept of the feast prepared; to-day is the accepted time. "Come, for all things are ready."—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

THE candidates for the Lady Margaret Professorship of Divinity at Oxford seem to have reduced themselves to one, Dr. Sanday, in whose favour an influential appeal has been signed by some sixty electors of all sorts, resident and non-resident, High Churchmen and Low Churchmen. The letter states that—"Whether as teacher, student, editor, or writer, Professor Sanday appears to us to possess exceptionally high claims. As Professor of Exegesis, although he has been obliged to supplement the inadequate income of that chair by taking other work which has severely taxed his time and energies, he has rendered inestimable services to the study and teaching of theology in Oxford. Alike on the score of his long professional experience, his literary distinction, and the assiduity with which he has promoted the interests of theological education and of theological learning since his return to Oxford thirteen years ago, we have good reason to believe that his transference to the Lady Margaret Chair would enable him to give even greater stimulus to the theological studies of the University than has hitherto been possible for him."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Askwith, Rev. Charles, B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, St. Albans; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the District of St Albans.
Back, Rev. H. C. A., M.A., Vicar of Haveringland; Secretary of the National Society for Sparham Deanery.
Burton, Rev. A. E., M.A., Mathematical Master of St. Peter's School, York; Warden and Head Master of Bishop Cotton's School, Bangalore, South India.
Cooper, Rev. Charles James, M.A.; Rector of Mundford, Norfolk.
Darling, Rev. J. L., M.A., Rector of Kinsale; Incumbent of the Mariners' Church Kingstown.
Downton, Rev. Cecil, B.A., Vicar of Hoxne; Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Deanery of Hoxne, Norwich.
Ellison, Rev. John H. J., M.A., Vicar of Windsor; Reader at Windsor Castle to Her Majesty.
Evans, Rev. David, Vicar of Abergele and Rural Dean of Rhos; Canon of St. Asaph.
Fawcett, Rev. Francis L'Estrange, M.A., Vicar of Stowmarket; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deanery of Stow.
Felix, Rev. Daniel, Curate of St. Mary's, Abergavenny; Rector of Llanhileth, Monmouthshire.
Fielder, Rev. Trevor, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Walthamstow; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deanery of North Barking.
Firth, Rev. Raywood, M.A., Chaplain of the Royal Surrey County Hospital; Perpetual Curate of Wanborough, Surrey.
Garnett, Rev. James Christopher, Vicar of Raveningham, Norwich; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Norfolk (Mr. Nicholas H. Bacon)
Gundry, Rev. Raymond Hugh, B.A., Curate of Biggleswade; Rector of Thirgby, Norfolk.
Hake, Rev. Lewis Francis, Curate of St. Michael's, Bournemouth; Vicar of Wraysbury, Bucks.
Harke, Rev. Henry Martyn, M.A., Curate of Mickleham; Vicar of St. Paul's, Tongham, Farnham.
Hibbert-Smith, Rev. J. T., Senior Curate of Gosforth, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Rector of Chevington.
Hill, Rev. Richard Charles, Curate; Rector of Panfield, Essex.
Hind, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Felsham, Bury St. Edmund's; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deaneries of Lavenham and Thedwastre.
Howard, Rev. Henry Frederick, M.A., Rector of Brightwalton; Rector of Catmore, Berks.
Hume, Rev. Henry Sykes, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Lowestoft; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deanery of Lothingland.
Husband, Rev. John Radclyffe, M.A.; Rector of Laverstoke-with-Frcefolk, Hants.
Jeffery, Rev. W. J., Curate of Helston; Chaplain and Secretary of the British Seamen's Orphan Boys' Home, Brixham.
King, Rev George Alfred, B.A., Curate of Avebury; Vicar of Easterton, Devizes.
Laffan, Rev. Robert Stuart de Courcy, M.A., Head Master of King Edward VI. School, Stratford-on-Avon; Principal of Cheltenham College.
Longlands, Rev. William Arthur, M.A.; Vicar of Littleton, Hants.
O'Brien, Rev. Rd., M.A., Rector of Hesketh; Secretary of the National Society for Leyland Deanery.
Phelps, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Ufton, Southam; Rural Dean of Southam.
Plumptre, Rev. John Bridges, M.A., Curate; Rector of Danbury, Essex.
Potter, Rev. R. H., M.A., Minister of Yarrawonga; Incumbent of Woodend, Diocese of Melbourne.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beattie, Rev. John, M.A., of Egham, at Brighton, on the 8th inst., aged 70.
Daubeny, Rev. John Hedley, on the 13th inst., aged 38.
Lediard, Rev. Arthur, at 18, Bullingdon-road, Oxford, on the 7th inst., aged 53.
Wilkinson, Rev. Ernest, at Southborough, Tunbridge Wells, on the 30th ult., aged 47.
Wilson, Rev. William, Rector, at Stoke Bruerne, Towcester, on the 4th inst., aged 66.

The Church of England Pulpit.

BALAAM:
A Lesson to the Man of the World and to the Professional Ecclesiastic.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A.,
Hon. Canon of Manchester.

Sermon Preached in Manchester Cathedral, on Sunday, May 5th, 1895.

"Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his."—Numbers xxiii. 10.

"I shall see Him, but not now: I shall behold Him, but not nigh."—Numbers xxiv. 17.

THE character of Balaam has been for ages a stock subject with preachers, and that not without reason, for it is very interesting, and all the more so because there is much in it which is very difficult to understand.

This interest of it remains equal, whatever view any of us may take of the narrative in which it appears. Whether that narrative be, according to the older orthodox view, an historical account, in which every act, as related, was really done, and every word really spoken; or if it be the creation of a poet, like Dante or Milton, whose aim was to convey moral and spiritual truths in a dress of fiction; or if, lastly, it be, taking a medium view, a memory of historic events, which a poet has embellished and idealised, still the character remains worthy of all the attention that it has received.

The two texts which I have read are the chief causes of perplexity to those who would understand the character. If they were absent, we should see in this prophet little more than a man of very limited views, who saw nothing, even in that vision of the Most High of which he boasted, but the short-lived victories over their border neighbours of that earthly nation whose singularity he had, indeed, remarked, but whose great mission he had hardly divined. Even when he beholds in his vision a star rising out of Jacob and a sceptre out of Israel, he anticipates no higher achievement for the coming Prince than to smite the corners of Moab, and to destroy all the children of Sheth.

Thus his prophetic foresight was vague and dim, but his moral position was lower still. We see in him the professional religious man, who makes a trade of his religion; powerfully attracted by the rewards of divination; ready to curse those whom God has blessed, if he can obtain permission so to do; cunning enough to see that the readiest way of drawing down God's curse on others is to tempt them to corrupt and demoralise themselves, though not enlightened enough to discern that, in such a case, the tempter is far more guilty than the tempted, and that the heaviest punishment must be reserved for him.

Yet, amidst this short sight and this moral degradation, there appear these two texts, which rise to a higher point than any others contained in the Books of Moses—nay, which rise to as high a point as can be reached by any one who has been a disciple of Christ Himself.

Let me ask your attention for a moment to these two texts.

The first is: "Let my soul (or my life) die the death of righteous men, and let my future be like that of one of them." The future, or latter end (as our translation gives it) is a very general expression (אַחֲרִיתִי), and may mean anything that comes after. The authors of the old Greek version of the Seventy thought that the prophet meant his posterity, and have so rendered the word (σπέρμα). But Balaam, it is to be feared, was too complete an egotist to have taken even that first step out of abject selfishness which makes a man care for his posterity more than for himself. The common traditional interpretation of the passage is the truest. The selfish, worldly prophet did actually desire for a moment that, when he died, he might die the death of righteous men, and that, whatever there be that follows death, might be for him such as it was for them.

This lofty sentiment is introduced into the discourse in the strangest manner. It comes in abruptly, entirely unconnected with the context on either side, and equally out of harmony with the character of the man who spoke the words and with the purpose upon which his mind was then employed. Is it, therefore, likely to be less true—true to nature, if the narrative be the creation of a poet, or true to fact if it be a record of history? Let any one look into his own heart and conduct, and he will find plenty of such inconsistencies there. Whether in history or in fiction, the man who was thoroughly consistent in deed and word and thought would be the marvel or paradox. We all desire, in our better moments, that we may die the death of righteous men, and that, whatever follows, death for us may be like what follows it for them. But does that momentary desire lead us to live habitually as they do? Does that sentiment harmonise with our prevailing character, with our general conduct, with the context of our lives?

Let us now turn to the second text.

Balaam had been speaking in a very boastful tone of his own spiritual enlightenment. He was the man whose eyes were open; he had heard the words of God, and knew the knowledge of the Most High; he had seen the vision of the Almighty, falling, yet having his eyes open. He had seen the *vision* of the Almighty and Infinite; but he expected something more than a vision, even to see the Being Himself. "I shall see Him, but not

now: I shall behold Him, but not nigh." The expectation of this recreant prophet does not halt one step behind that of Job, who hoped hereafter to see God, his Redeemer or his Avenger; nor behind that of the writer of the Apocalypse, that we shall see His face; or that of the beloved disciple, that we shall see Him as He is; or even that of St. Paul, when he held forth, as the ultimate goal of man, the prospect that we shall see no longer through a glass darkly, but face to face, and shall know even as we are known. This second high expectation comes into the prophet's discourse almost as abruptly, and quite as inconsistently, as the former one; and, as was remarked in the other case, it is none the less true to nature because it is so inconsistent. We too expect to meet our God; but do we spend our lives in preparation for that meeting?

Let us now pass onward, from this review of our two texts, to a consideration of the character of the man who spoke them.

It is not unlikely that some of my present hearers may be well acquainted with that view of the character which is exhibited in the famous sermon of Bishop Butler on this subject—a monumental discourse, which, in strange contrast to these ephemeral pulpit addresses of ours, has lived, and has become one of the classics of the English language.

That great divine treats this prophet as an example of a man of enlightened conscience, accustomed to contemplate the coming change of death, and not without forebodings of the judgment that must follow, sensible of the final separation that must then take place between the righteous and the wicked, and hoping, at least vaguely, that his own lot may be then found among the righteous; yet nevertheless so attracted by objects of low worldly desire as to question and argue against the clear pronouncements of his conscience, and thus to pervert the testimony of God's voice within him. The Bishop uses the character to enforce the very salutary lesson, that, in cases where the right and the wrong are clear, the first warning voice of conscience should be taken as its decisive and final verdict, especially when it forbids an act which is for our evident worldly advantage, or commands one which is opposed to our worldly interests; and he shows that the after process of reasoning, into which we are too apt to enter, is often only, as it was with Balaam, an attempt to find excuses for a thing that we desire, though we know it to be wrong; and that such a process perverts the conscience and leads to a state of judicial blindness, in which a man can no longer distinguish right from wrong, and comes at last, like the self-deceiving prophet, to the latter end of the unrighteous.

Everyone can see that this lesson of the great Bishop is a very salutary one, applicable to all the affairs of life, and useful to all persons, in whatever position they may be placed. For there is no one, who has a conscience at all, who is not met in practical life by cases of conscience, in which the inward voice checks him with the question, in regard to some intention of his, Is this that you are designing right or wrong? And there are very few who have not, many a time in their lives, been tempted by self-interest or inclination to seek excuses for disobeying the clear pronouncements of the inward voice.

This is the lesson for the man of the world: Listen to your conscience; obey its inward voice; do not seek to evade its commands, even when they lead to failure instead of success, to loss instead of gain. Take heed that you do not, by resistance or by special pleading of any kind, spoil that delicate instrument, which God has given you to guide your course through the confusions and difficulties of this present life.

But there is one point of view in which the great divine whom I have quoted does not seem to have considered the character which he has so ably drawn, and that is as a minister of religion. He does not make a special application of his lesson to persons to whom, like himself and like ourselves, religion is a professional thing.

Nor is he singular in this omission. We teachers of religion warn others of moral dangers, but we often fall into the same ourselves; we denounce the faults of others, and are apt to be very silent about our own.

I think that we are very much to blame for this omission. Let us consider for a moment how very different in this respect was our great Teacher and Exemplar, Jesus Christ. His discourses contain only one stern invective, and that is addressed to those who, according to his own admission, sat in Moses' seat.

And those public teachers of His day understood His meaning but too well, and recognised in Him the opponent whom they must destroy. As we were reading a few weeks ago, the priests, the sons of Aaron, the scribes who sat in Moses' seat, the whole estate of the elders, the whole council of the chosen people, with the heaven-appointed primate at their head, were those who, by an unanimous vote, condemned Him to die as a blasphemer. How very seldom do we, who ourselves belong to the religious world, lay to heart this awful fact, which nevertheless is certain and indisputable, that the greatest crime in history was entirely the work of professors of religion, under the guidance and influence of their ministers and priests. The open sinners, the publicans and harlots, had no hand in Christ's death at all.

With this tremendous example before our eyes, should we not be wrong if we passed in silence that view of this prophet's character and conduct which deals with him as a minister of religion? We, who would fain think ourselves successors of the Apostles, must take warning from the awful crime of the sons of Aaron and successors of Moses; nor

may we venture to assume that, in matters where others differ from us, or oppose, or correct us, God is certainly for us and against the other side. Rather should we confess, in all humble cautiousness, that God may have His voices, in which He speaks to man, outside the limits of our ceremonial, and of our tradition, and of our authority, even as He had in those days when He spoke by the voice of the Lord Jesus.

Let us, then, venture to make this application now.

We may find in the Old Testament, and more or less in all the religions of the world, two distinct classes of professional religious men—prophets and priests. The prophets were those to whom communications of divine light and grace were immediate and direct. They were those who, like Balaam, heard the words of God and saw the vision of the Almighty; or, to take higher examples, they were men, like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face, and with whom He spoke familiarly as a man speaketh with his friend; to whom, as to Ezekiel, the heavens were opened, and who saw the visions of God; to whom, like many others, outwardly or inwardly, the word of God came. The priests were those, to whom what they received of Divine enlightenment or grace came through the medium of ordered and regulated ceremonial. In the Old Testament, amongst the Hebrew nation, the prophet seems to have eclipsed the priest, so that the people expected the word of God from him almost alone. Amongst ourselves, for whom the word of God is scarce and there is no prophet more, the priest, in his ceremonial, is nearly all of professional religion which still remains. I suppose that these pulpit addresses of ours are the only vestige of the prophetic function which yet remains within the Church; and how feeble that remainder is those know equally who prepare those discourses and who listen to them.

But, whichever of these two classes be the more prominent at any particular period, each is equally liable to that degradation of views and motives which we have observed in the case of Balaam. All professional religious men, priests, prophets, or preachers, are in danger of becoming secularised. And in that secularisation two distinct steps may be observed: one, the lowest and coarsest, which is the pursuit by the individual of his own personal and private interests; and the other, higher and less coarsely selfish, but still quite earthly, the devotion of the ecclesiastic to the corporate interests of his Church, which has become for him an *alter ego*, a second self.

The man who is our subject of to-day stood on the lowest of these two grounds. He did not, indeed, jump at once at the rewards of divination which Balak's princes carried in their hands; but yet he permitted himself to hanker after them, and he perverted his conscience in order to obtain from it permission to accept them. Worldly profit, even to the extent of the king's house full of silver and gold, preferments to very great honour, and, what is to a man of ability and power the most seducing bait of all, the prospect of a conspicuous career—such were the temptations which floated before this prophet's eyes, and such are those which life presents to the aspiring ecclesiastic now. And it seems hard to such an one when Jehovah, through the voice of conscience and the dictates of the moral law, holds him back from these honours and advantages when they seem actually within his reach.

But this coarse personal temptation is not the only one that besets the professional ecclesiastic. Besides his own personal interests, he has in his hands the corporate interests of his Church, as an institution clothed with earthly dignity, and wielding earthly power. He feels himself morally bound to promote those interests, and by degrees he comes to identify them with the cause of God. When he considers the means by which those interests may be promoted, he sees some which are undoubtedly good and righteous, but also others which are mixed, and some which are positively evil; and too often it appears to him that those means which are a mixture of good and evil, and even those which are positively evil, tend to immediate success, as in fact they often do. It is from the use of the lower class of means that have proceeded the sins and crimes which have stained, not only coarse worldly men like Balaam or Caiaphas, but pure and self-denying men like Saul of Tarsus. Hence the persecutions and wars and massacres with which Church history has been stained. Hence the pious frauds, which have been wrought in support of what their authors sincerely believed to be the truth of God. Hence the double-dealing policy which has in many ages brought on the priesthood a not undeserved reputation of craft and guile.

The remedy for this evil is an assured conviction that God's only command to every man is simple truthfulness and unswerving right, and that no other means can possibly promote His cause. Whatever be the question that an ecclesiastic may have in hand—a question of Church government, a question of doctrine, a question of ritual—his simple duty is to discard all considerations of expediency or opportuneness, and, without the slightest heed to the consequences that may follow, to speak the truth and to do the right. Such action may seem to lead to failure and defeat, but such defeat and failure is never final. The triumph of the right and true may be delayed for generations—nay, for centuries, as it was in the case of Jesus of Nazareth Himself; but it is sure. The nemesis of the false word or of the wrong action may be long in coming; but it will come. The times and the seasons when truth and right will have their perfect victory are in the Lord's hands, not in ours. For us the highest policy is to make each action right, and each word truthful, and to leave all the rest to Him.

To keep alive in heart and mind this faith in truth and right, especially if at any time earthly success seems falling to the other side, it needs that those lofty thoughts which visited for a moment the self-seeking prophet should become the prevailing thoughts of our minds. "I shall see Him, but not now: I shall behold Him, but not nigh." "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." Whether our temptations be the coarser baits which seduce the man of the world, or the more specious inducements which are presented to the ecclesiastic, the remedial thoughts must ever be that of approaching death, and of the Presence in which death will place us, and of the tribunal before which our actions, words, intentions, and whole character must then present themselves.

Permit me to hold these thoughts for one moment longer before our minds.

Death, which has come so near to some of us, is, beyond all doubt, the greatest event in human existence. It has very repellent features, which no man loves to contemplate, and which all attempt to hide. When it occurs to others, we surround it with ceremonial, beautifying it with poetry and music, and smothering it in a heap of flowers. But those ornaments are for the survivors only, not for the dead. The one who is the chief, though silent, subject of the solemn function must look at the great event in all its nakedness; and he who is expecting its approach cannot be content without reality.

It is but little that we really know respecting it. In no case are the words more deeply true that "he who thinketh he knoweth anything, knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know;" and he who pretends to know the things that he does not know is only a false witness before God. The most certain thing of all is that, for those who die, the form or fashion of this world will have entirely passed away. Παράγει τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. The earthly objects that we have sought, the works that we have done, the profits that we have realised, the fortunes that we have made, the careers that we have run, or the failures that we have experienced in our attempts at any of these objects—all will be past and gone, and nothing remain to us of them all, except the responsibility.

But not merely these personal objects will then be found quite removed along with the world to which they belong. The same event will have happened to those institutions to which the professional ecclesiastic has devoted so much thought and zeal. The buildings which he has erected and decorated—it may be for the glory of God, or it may be for the honour of the builder; the organisation which he has tried so hard to believe himself, and to persuade others, is something more than human; the ceremonial, in words and tones and attitudes, which he has offered to God, or, it may be, only exhibited before men; the system of doctrines to which he has applied imposing names—holy truth, catholic truth, definite knowledge—but which is, at best, only a faint shadow of things unknown to and inconceivable by man—all these, too, will be found to have been parts of that scheme or fashion of this world, which will have disappeared. This is what the Apostle teaches: "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." Or, if we prefer to express the same truth in the more modern language of a prophet of our own, we may say—

> Our little systems have their day,
> They have their day, and cease to be;
> They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O God, art more than they.

When all present things are thus swept away, the hope of all prophets alike has been that, in the new world which the dead will enter, he will find himself at least one step nearer to the sight of God. It is true that the Deity will be still, and must remain for ever, the King eternal, immortal, invisible, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see. Even in that higher state, which is the hope of all mankind, the limited will hardly have become able to apprehend the Infinite. But it is to be hoped that those who enter the higher world will become more able to embrace the one truth respecting the Deity, which Jesus the Christ laboured to impress upon every mind, that man's Creator is man's Father. It may be feared that the theology of the schools and the ceremonial of the churches have tended rather to obscure than to display the Master's own favourite truth, that the Creator of all is the Father of all, not only bearing a father's natural affection, but also holding. and acknowledging, and performing a father's natural duties to every child. This was what Jesus really taught: "If ye, being evil," He said, "know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give all good things to them that ask Him." If ye earthly parents do your duties—though how imperfectly!—to your own, how much more shall the All-Father do His duties perfectly to all. Will He not provide for the happiness of those to whom, not by their own choice, but by His, He has given the gift and responsibility of life, and to whom He has appointed once to die, and after that the judgment? He who leaves this world will have approached at least one step nearer to the Father of Jesus Christ, who is also our Father—Father of those sons who have remained faithful in His home, Father also of those prodigals who have wandered far away.

But in that nearer approach to God is included, as we have seen, the thought of judgment; and that thought is indestructible in man. The poetical

imagery which has gathered round it may be destined to fade away; the great white throne may no longer be looked on as a material object; the books of record may be only figures of speech; the

Tuba mirum spargens sonum
Per sepulchra regionum

may be ceasing to vibrate, as a material sound-producing instrument, in human ears. But the great thought of responsibility, which is presented in all those poetical images, remains indelible in the heart and mind of man. Even now the voice of our conscience calls us to account. There is something in us that hears that voice, though not the outward ear. We hear it and we feel it. Just so our God will call us to account in that new world which we expect to enter—our God, our Judge, but also our Father, who knows all. And our great consolation will be that He does know all, and that no sham or lie will ever pass with Him, as such do pass and succeed in this present world.

These higher views, which opened for a moment, and only for a moment, on the worldly prophet's mind, should become present and prevailing in our minds. If so, they will be found the remedy needed, both by the man who is entangled in the world of trade and business, and by him whose mind is occupied by the plans and schemes of the world of politics, or of the world of ecclesiasticism. They say to each of these alike: This world, in which you live and move and have your being, is passing away. You know not what the future is to be, neither your own future in that new world to which you go; nor the future of your posterity, if it is for them that you have planned and schemed; nor the future of the State or the Church, which has been the scene of your activity and of your ambitions. But you may be sure that that future will be something very different from what you expect or dream. Things have happened, in your own experience of the past, which have seemed to you very strange, and, perhaps, very disappointing; and God has many more surprises in store for those coming generations, which you will not see. It is He, not you, nor your party, nor your school of thought, that will regulate the future of the world, of the State, and of the Church. Cease, then, from pretentious aims and aspiring enterprises, and be content in humble dutifulness to make each intention or motive pure, each action righteous, and each word truthful, leaving all the rest to Him. Pure intentions, righteous acts, and truthful words are the constituent parts of human righteousness. They only are God's command to man; they only will be inquired into at the last great account; they only prepare for coming death, and for the presence of the All-seeing God, our Father in Heaven.

THE committee of the Additional Curates Society have received a special donation of £500 to meet the society's present urgent needs.

GOD'S TREASURE IN EARTHEN VESSELS.

BY THE REV. H. BIDDELL, M.A., LATE SCHOLAR OF MAGDALENE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

SERMON PREACHED IN DEDHAM CHURCH, ON SUNDAY, APRIL 28TH, 1895.

"We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."—2 COR. iv. 7.

IN this morning's first lesson we have one of those many scenes in which the children of Israel murmured against the God who was leading them by hard and unknown ways to the Promised Land. The great heart of their Leader was constantly being tried by the childish discontent and miserable selfish mutiny of these faint-hearted sons of bondage. He was ready to give his very life and soul for them, and they were always ready to turn on him and smite God in the face for bringing them away from the cucumbers and leeks and flesh-pots of Egypt to wander through the barren wastes of the desert. What wonder then that sometimes he despaired like Elijah, like John the Baptist, and was ready to give up the task. What wonder that he "spoke unadvisedly with his lips" when the people "provoked" him so. God had not told him to rebuke them, and he was to give them water by *a word* in order that God might be glorified. Moses speaks angrily and treats their rebellion as a personal slight, and then in his hasty indignation smites twice where he was not told to smite once. The offence in which Aaron shared was that no attempt was made by them to make the need of the people an occasion for glorifying God. Compare his indignant speech here with his calm, noble words by the Red Sea: "Fear ye not, stand still and see the salvation of the Lord, which He will show you to-day . . . . . The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace." Or again, compare it with the protest of Joshua and Caleb, a protest which made them worthy to enter the land which was forbidden to Moses and Aaron. When the people were fearful because of the perils of that unknown Promised Land, the Faithful Two spoke out for the honour of God. "If the Lord delight in us, then He will bring us into this land . . . . . only rebel not ye *against the Lord* . . . . . the Lord is with us, fear not."

Several explanations are given of the actual sin which Moses committed and which made God punish him so severely. But the simplest and clearest explanation is to take God's own words: "Because ye believed Me not, to sanctify *Me* in the eyes of the children of Israel." And when you read Moses' angry words you see no trace of righteous indignation, jealous for the honour of God. Probably both he and Aaron were smarting

under the recent pain of the insults given to Aaron by Korah and his followers. Up till then Moses had pleaded for the people when God was angry, but now he was very angry at the insult offered to the priesthood and to himself as Leader. And when God had vindicated the dignity of the offices which He had appointed, may it not have been the natural result that Moses and Aaron should begin to think too much of themselves and too little of God—to speak of the people as being rebels without mentioning God, and to fetch water from the rock as though by their own power. It was a natural and a small fault, you say. Not in the Leader of the Nation, not in the High Priest of God. The higher the office or position, the greater the responsibility. God had vindicated with awful power the dignity of Aaron and Moses in their official capacities as Priest and Leader. The least they could do was to use their great power to show forth the honour and glory of God.

One great lesson to be drawn from this story is that which St. Paul gives us in my text: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." He has been talking of the ministry of the New Testament. He says that if the old ministry of the law was so glorious that it transformed the face of Moses when he came down from the Mount with the two tables of stone after that wonderful communion with God in the Mount of Fire, "how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious. For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." He claims, you see, even greater glory for his office than was given to Moses, but he goes on to point out how the glory is all God's shown in weak human bodies which are frail and common as earthen vessels, so that no one may presume to think, as Moses did, that the power is man's, but all may see that the power is of God. Let us follow out these thoughts:—

1. The minister's *office* is glorious.

2. The *minister* is human and weak and the glory is God's.

I think we want as much as ever to realise the importance of recognising the dignity of the ministry of Christ. Those who bear it are the ambassadors of Christ, the heralds of the Messiah, the Shepherds of the Flock, the Stewards of the Eternal Mysteries of the kingdom; and if their office is open to insult and indignity, then God's Holy Name is not sanctified. Supposing our great empire sends out a representative into a foreign land, she will spend much treasure of money and precious lives in protecting the honour of England in the person of that ambassador, consul, or commissioner. She does not stop to inquire into his private life; that has nothing to do with it. He may have acted hastily and with indiscretion. But the honour and dignity and authority of the empire must be thought of first. So we who are ambassadors of the King of kings hold an office which we should all be jealous to protect from insult. *All* of us, I say. Why should it be left to the clergy to uphold the honour of this office in the esteem of the world. Is it not true that the minister of Christ is always considered a fair butt for every joke and jest, good or bad, because his name is sure to predispose the thoughtless and prejudiced hearers to laugh? Is it not true that if a man gets up on a platform and sings a silly drunken song about "the parson" that he can raise roars of laughter and not a single layman will protest against it? Is it not true that half the jokes that float about the press and society hold up to ridicule the weaknesses and the faults of ministers of Christ? Within limits, no doubt, satire and jests which are not malicious and are founded on fact may do good to the class of men at whose expense they are made. Clergymen are men with many faults and those faults they cannot see in themselves, and perhaps it is good for them to be pilloried like other public men in in order that they may see their own faults. But we ought to protest against the custom, the pointless and dangerous custom, of dragging dignity in the dirt for the sake of raising a cheap and easy laugh. It may be said that when the clergy as a class are worthy of the name they bear, men will respect them. This is not quite true. The more we do our duty, the more enemies we make, and there are many only too ready to sneer at men whose lives are a protest against their own. Of course we bring a good deal on ourselves. For that, may God have mercy on us in the Day of Judgment.

Again, there is a very good custom which is growing more prevalent but which some people are afraid of, the custom of rising when the ministers of God enter the Church to exercise their office in the congregation for the worship of God. It has long been the custom to do so when a bishop enters: some people think that this act of respect is fitting for all offices of the ministry. Why should it be thought strange to do such honour to this office as a gentleman does when a lady enters an ordinary room, as is done in the presence of certain civil dignitaries without the slightest thought of the worthiness or unworthiness of the person. No one thinks—certainly it would be a grievous mistake to think—that there is any idea of doing honour to man as man, and many clergy shrink from asking the congregation to do it for fear of being misunderstood. It is one of those harmless customs which only want explaining and understanding to be made a useful means of teaching reverence for an office that ever is, and ever will be, the most glorious that is bestowed on man. Why should it make the minister conceited? St. Paul "magnifies his office" when needful above that of Moses and Aaron, and

yet no one is more humble *as a man* than he, the "chief of sinners," "not meet to be called an Apostle."

Again, we are in great danger in the present day of forgetting that the ministers of Christ whom everybody criticises so freely and so naturally in their desire to have worthy ministers filled with the overpowering might of the Spirit and walking humbly and righteously with God—a noble example to their flock—we forget, I say, that when they fall short of our expectations, that the grace of God is not hindered. People will refuse to come to church if the sermon be not good enough for them, and it is astonishing how dainty we all are now in the matter of sermons, while the glorious worship, our forefathers' magnificent legacy in the Common Prayer Book, seems as nothing. Even the Litany is despised, that Litany which is the most marvellous expression of man's need and God's glory that language ever framed. A noted Roman Catholic priest (who has since become a Unitarian) once told me that he considered it the grandest devotional work he had ever read. Yes, men will turn away from the streams of grace that flow from prayer and praise, from hearing of God's Word and the Sacramental Feast of their Lord's Body and Blood, because the minister is unworthy or even unpopular. Yet Christ upheld the authority of the priesthood, corrupt as it was. "Go show thyself to the priest," He says to the leper. And in every way He observed the "righteousness of the Law." And so our 26th Article teaches us that the unworthiness of the ministers does not in any way hinder the effect of the Sacraments; and we know that, though Moses sinned in his hasty anger, the water flowed just the same; though Balaam had greed in his heart, and was a false prophet, yet the blessings of God flowed from his lips over the tents of Israel; though Judas was black at heart, he went forth with the faithful Apostles on their errand of mercy and ministration. Christ chose Judas to have all the authority of an Apostle, though He knew that he had a devil's heart. Dare we so blaspheme as to "limit the Holy One of Israel"? Dare we believe that He can only let His bountiful grace do us good when it comes from clean hands and pure hearts? Is it not rather a grand proof of God's almighty glory that the light of His glorious Gospel streams through the cracks of the frail and common earthen vessels, so that all men may see the excellency of the power to be of God, and not of men? And no priest, no man, can come between us and God.

I remember reading a remarkable speech of a well-known labour leader at one of the Church Congresses spoken to an audience of working men. He was giving his reasons why he attended church and not chapel, and he said one of his strongest reasons was that, at chapel, the personality of the minister dominated everything, so that if the minister was sad and suffering, the service was utterly sad, and every extempore prayer and all the service generally reflected the moods and fancies of the minister; whereas, at church, the fixed Liturgy, the regulated service, lifted everything more or less out of the reach of the minister, so that if the worshipper wanted help and comfort, he could get it from the Lord's Prayer and the grand Collects, the Litany, or the Psalms, and no mood or fancy of man could hinder him. So with the precious food that God gives us in the Holy Communion. No man can rob us of our food, the children's food from the table of our Father. The heart may be unclean and the life barren of the man who ministers, but God consecrates the bread and wine, and God gives us Himself.

Of course unworthy ministers do much hinder the spread of the Gospel, and upon us who dare to meddle with holy things a terrible responsibility rests: "Be ye clean, ye that bear the vessels of the Lord." We may not presume to rob God of His glory. If our actions and words bring heavenly manna down to hungry souls, and the heavenly rod in our hands makes the living waters flow, how great is God's glory, how grand is our office, how utterly unworthy we to dispense the heavenly good! Brethren, criticise us as men, tell us of our faults, but above all pray for us. Sometimes you little guess how heavy hangs the burden of the glorious ministry on the shoulders of a man of like passions with yourselves. You provoke us sometimes to speak unadvisedly with our lips, as Moses said of the children of Israel; and though we ought to be above such unworthy feelings, we do feel personal slights and insults; and though we may be misunderstood, we do most of us sincerely desire to do our duty and sanctify the Lord in ourselves and the people. Pray that God will fill His ministers with more and more of that unselfish devotion which, while it magnifies the office, while it makes the ambassador speak out boldly on behalf of the King of kings, while it is jealous for the honour and dignity of an office so glorious, yet makes the man himself more humble, more conscious of personal failings, more fearful lest, at the great Day, when the Chief Shepherd shall call His shepherds to give account of all the sheep and lambs whom He has entrusted to their charge, there may be so many missing, so many maimed and injured and lost, that the shepherd himself may not stand against the Day of Reckoning.

THE collections at the annual sermons in connection with Holy Trinity Day and Sunday Schools, Bolton, on a recent Sunday, realised the large total of £418, which the Rev. T. Taylor Evans, vicar of the parish, declares is the largest sum that has been obtained in any church in England for similar purposes. The congregation at the evening service numbered 2,500, and 1,500 scholars took part in a procession in the morning.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 25, 1895.

MORITURI.

THE last persons to give up hope for a sick man are the doctors. In the same way, about the worst symptom in the case of the present Administration is the very remarkable kind of consolation proffered by some of their supporters in the sad affliction of the bye-elections. It amounts to this: There is no evidence, as yet, that the tide of public opinion has definitely turned against the Government.

That is the summary of all the elaborate disquisitions on the "Science of bye-elections" which have been published in the semi-official Radical Press. The conclusion has been arrived at by some quaint processes of selection and suppression; but we need not, on that account, quarrel with this *reductio ad absurdum* of the "flowing tide." To admit that there is no strong feeling in favour of the Government measures and policy is, practically, to admit defeat and prepare for extinction. It is the death-knell of the Government, tolled by its own supporters, for Ministers long ago staked all upon the existence of this feeling. For instance, Home Rule, which though virtually laid aside, is still paraded at the head of the Rosebery programme, is confessed to depend upon the success of the English propaganda. However indiscreet may have been the allusion of the Prime Minister to the conversion of the "predominant partner," none can dispute its truth. But after nearly three years we have now an official confession that not one step has been made towards that wished-for consummation. The unconverted, but still predominant, partner remains impenitent.

Welsh Disestablishment, Local Veto, and One Man One Vote seem fizzing out in the same ineffectual fashion. In the first we have actually had the extraordinary spectacle of the Welsh members, supposed to be the mouthpieces of the Welsh people, speaking on a matter upon which they have made up their minds, voting against their own proposals, rejecting their own demands, in order to save the Government from defeat by a majority of ten. In the second we seem to have found the rock which is most likely to wreck the Ministerial bark. It has caused much searching of heart, many threats of secession, and may lead to a revolt *en bloc* of the Irishry. A measure viewed with such mixed feelings in the House of Commons can hardly be thought to carry much weight in the country. The last on the programme, One Man One Vote, has not yet reached serious consideration.

There remains the resolution against the House of Lords. How the wire-pullers propose to get the steam up on this movement remains to be seen. But it is hardly likely that the collective impetus of all these hang-fires can amount to much, and that the English nation will turn again and rend the Lords for rejecting bills for which nobody cares a button. The English elector has not yet been stirred up to care to give a single additional vote for Home Rule, or Welsh Disestablishment, or Local Veto, or One Man One Vote, and we confess we fail to see how the Government can do much more to rouse him. Ministers have fired off every shot they had, and they have all missed, as they themselves acknowledge.

There is only one construction to be put upon these semi-official utterances. They are a gradual preparation of the public mind, or such small fraction of it as cares, for the inevitable, and now swiftly approaching, collapse. Ministers have been much misled. Not themselves particularly in touch with public feeling they have allowed themselves to be guided by their party wire-pullers, who, in order to further local and sectional aims, have entirely misrepresented the true state of affairs. In this way the claims of all kinds of cranks have been invested with importance absurdly out of proportion to their merits, and Ministers have been made, in reality, the tools of insignificant factions, while imagining themselves to be the leaders of great causes. And now the very men who have brought all this about, who have talked big about "filling up the cup" and posed as the Hampdens and Cromwells of this generation, confess that they have no backing as yet, and that the country is at this moment absolutely indifferent towards the questions which were declared, twelve months ago, to be agitating society to its very foundations. It looks as if they had been found out, that the Government has at last recognised the futility of its position, and is rapidly completing its arrangements for dissolution. The Government has long been declared to be moribund; it is now plainly

in *articulo mortis*, the end cannot be far off. The precise method of extinction cannot at present be guessed at, but it will be sudden and rapid. It is, in fact, extremely probable that the details are already settled and only wait a favourable opportunity, which a few days may give, to be carried into execution.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE re-marriage of divorced persons, which Father Black has succeeded in making a practical question that cannot be any longer shirked, has been discussed recently in the two Houses of Convocation and in the House of Laymen. The Bishop of London does not seem to have referred to the scene at St. Mark's, North Audley Street, or to his own authority as Bishop in the refusal of licences, but he characterised the present legal right of the guilty party to a divorce suit to demand the blessing of the Church on a new union as an intolerable scandal. The Bishops are apparently agreed in desiring to put an end to the scandal. The House of Laymen unanimously approved Mr. Athelstan Riley's Bill now before the House of Commons, which relieves the clergy from the obligation of lending their churches for the marriage ceremonies in question.

Canon Gore, in a letter which he has written on the subject, expresses the opinion that the first step to be taken by aggrieved clergymen is to make a serious attempt to persuade Parliament to relieve their consciences of the burden laid upon them by the legal requirement to lend their churches. He adds: "If we fail in securing this—which there is real reason to hope may not be the case—we shall have, no doubt, to resort to more painful courses to rid ourselves of complicity, as a Church, in what we believe to amount to a serious disobedience to a Divine law. But we must surely make a serious attempt with Parliament first." This is sound advice. The "more painful courses" alluded to are not to be contemplated with a light heart.

The election of Lord Ashcombe to succeed the late Lord Selborne as chairman of the House of Laymen will be received with general satisfaction. If Lord Cranbrook had accepted the proposal that he should fill the vacant office, he would doubtless have been unanimously elected, but the veteran peer fairly urged his weight of years as a reason for declining the honour. Lord Cranbrook did not speak too severely of the ill-judged remark made by Sir Walter Phillimore that the proposal of Lord Ashcombe was a political move. It would be a very sorry day, he observed, for the Church of England when her defenders were separated into two parties.

Lord Ashcombe was appointed a Church Estates Commissioner in 1874, and his services to the Church have entitled him to a position in which he has been placed. As he said in returning thanks for his election, which, Sir W. Phillimore notwithstanding, was unanimous, he cannot but feel the responsibilities of an office filled by Lord Selborne. No living man, it may be said, without offence to any, has attained to the combined wisdom and sanctity which made Roundell Palmer's name illustrious. The new chairman paid a richly merited tribute to the ripe experience and unwearied industry of the vice-chairman, Mr. Spottiswoode.

A true story from Wales, which is published by the *Record*, reveals the strength of the Church feeling aroused by the Disestablishment agitation. In a widely-scattered parish, the working men expressed their desire that the task of gathering signatures for the petition against Mr. Asquith's Bill should be entrusted to them, and, in order that those who took the petition round might not be the losers, their fellow-workmen clubbed together and paid them the equivalent of their wages for the two days which they were off work. One would like to hear the Bishop of Hereford's comment on facts like this.

If the Welsh people are so anxious to get rid of the Church as Bishop Percival asserts they are, why do they not petition for the Bill? As matter of fact, according to the latest official figures, the number of petitions against the Bill has reached 2,801, with an aggregate of 655,327 signatures. On the other hand, only two petitions, with 462 signatures, have been sent to the House of Commons in its favour.

"A Member of the London Diocesan Conference" writes:—"Since the decision of the Conference in favour of pew-rents, which I confess was a surprise to myself, though I voted in the majority, I have received by post a lot of leaflets in behalf of the Free and Open Church movement, by which the senders hope, I suppose, to bring me to a better mind. A correspondent of the *Church Times* attributes the result to the vote having been taken in a thin house, and thinks it can scarcely be doubted that a different decision would have been come to with a larger aggregate vote. It is impossible to say for certain what might have been, but the feeling of the Conference appeared to me unmistakeable from the very beginning of the debate. Nobody can really doubt that there has been a reaction from the state of feeling on the subject which so widely prevailed a few years ago."

The new practice—for it is comparatively new—of holding occasional confirmations in the evening is much to be commended. It enables many to attend who would perhaps be otherwise prevented from doing so. But discretion is needed. As a correspondent of the *Record* points out, the services are occasionally prolonged to an hour which may involve trouble to some of the candidates. A recent service in a church near Gray's Inn Road was prolonged till after ten o'clock, and, as the writer remarks, some of the young maid-servants confirmed could not have reached their homes before half-past ten. Unsympathetic mistresses, of whom there not a few, might not unreasonably object to this.

Those good people who have persuaded themselves that religion is most flourishing in countries where there is no national religious profession may be commended to reflection on the state of affairs in America, lately made by Dr. Gailor, the Assistant Bishop of Tennessee. According to a summary furnished by the New York correspondent of the *Rock*, the Bishop said in effect:—There are in the United States 128 Christian denominations, with 15 non-Christian and 156 unattached congregations. These denominations represent differences of doctrinal belief and practice on almost every article of the Christian faith. Even the subtlest metaphysical speculations and the simplest variations in taste and temperament are held as sufficient matters of conscience for separation in public worship; and all the while 68 per cent. of the population are reported as without any religion, and infidelity is every day more aggressive and widespread.

SOME THINGS IN PARTICULAR.

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C. stated :—

Some acquired characteristics of human personality are not handed down for inheritance. Many things, bad and good, are not inherited by the offspring ; but some acquired characters must be inherited, or there cannot be any evolution. As all are not inherited, and indeed so many left out, it is certain that evolution does not fully account either for development or deterioration. That birds will be like birds and men like men is a matter of history ; but birds and men could not make themselves by selection out of that which was essentially different. We accept descent with modifications as the general rule ; and that the earth with the sun were and are the agents for the production of these modifications, but not that this modification, acknowledged to be a scientific and an historical fact, is wrought by varying circumstances, and never amounts to a new creation. It is not a true nor a sufficient explanation of circumstances and their origin that they change, and that other things also change in part. The earliest known orohippus, about the size of a rabbit, may or may not have given us all the horses. As to the transmutation of plants (Planorbis), flat-leaved on one side and convex on the other, who will tell why they change? and the secret as to horse and orohippus, if it is not the Eternal Power behind?

Professor Dana states : "There are no links lowering man to the beast." Until some are found science can never assert that they ever existed. Materialism, pretending to explain everything by matter and force, is an error that sinks a man lower than humanity. Hourly changes make hourly displacements, not because things weary of their place, seek a change, and are better or worse as they rightly seek. Some insects are of this colour, others of that ; some birds are long-winged, others short-winged ; some animals are weak, some are very strong ; plants change and are a puzzle to gardeners and farmers ; but the fable of natural selection, and much of the delusion as to the power of circumstances, are a romance of cerebration.

The plant-specks in a pool, the monad that we are told became a man, were all alike once. Were they? Who knows! Take the life-point of a nettle, of a mouse, of a man. They are all structureless, the most powerful microscope cannot detect any difference ; but one grows into nettle, another into mouse, the third into man ; there was an essential difference separating every one. Was it not from the beginning? or when did it come? Is it not wiser and more scientific to say, "The Eternal Power made and still makes the difference."

You cannot, when things are all alike, make odds evens by pushing them about. Lobsters, insects, spiders, centipedes, were once of the same fundamental structure ; a differentiating Power wrought the change. The arm of a man, the wing of a bird, the horse's foreleg, the dog's fore-limb, the whale's paddle, display a former unity of structure, substance, strength. There must have been a separating, an again mixing, different and differently, but not by the things themselves. It was by the Power whom we revere clothing Himself with the universe as a many-coloured garment of power, of beauty, of life. The whole of creation is a prophecy of higher types. The study of them leads to universal ideas, forms grand characters, makes life an ever-revealing picture of wonderful advance, of realisable realms of beauty, a life of splendour amidst ennobling occupations.

"What is Life?" will be the subject next Wednesday.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Slothfulness. "A slothful man hideth his hand in his bosom" (Prov. xix. 24). Introduction.—Slothfulness is more than idleness. It is a settled habit of idleness and a continuous indulgence in that degrading characteristic. We may justly affirm that it lies at the root of all evil, all sin, and the words in the hymn are too true :—

> Satan finds some evil still
> For idle hands to do.

It produces a very baneful influence among individuals and in society. Let us briefly consider a few of the evils it produces :—1. In worldly concerns. There are many who might have an opportunity of being prosperous. God has given them a time in their lives of acquiring this world's goods, but they have misused them and lived in laziness and useless extravagance. What has been the consequence? They have finally died in the workhouse in penury and want. Many a youth with bright prospects has shattered his hopes and anticipations of his friends by yielding to this specious temptation of the evil one. 2. In intellectual matters. In the present age we have many privileges—books, colleges, schools, churches, and literary institutions ; there are Sunday-schools, and means employed for the intellectual advancement of both old and young ; Bibles are almost given away, and books and magazines are freely distributed in our Sunday-schools. But although we are so highly favoured, we find many young people too indolent to use the means provided. Many Sunday-school scholars, we observe, are lazy while in the Sunday-school ; they sit in an indolent manner, they carelessly use the Bible, and pay no attention to their teachers. Beware, and do not abuse these great blessings that you enjoy by being lazy and indifferent to the great purpose and concerns of life, for "where much is given much will be required." 3. In spiritual concerns. The Gospel is presented to all, therefore it is the duty to accept it ; but the slothful and indolent are quite unconcerned about this important matter. Their language is, "Go thy way for this time, and when I have a more convenient season I will send for thee." Multitudes walk this earth of ours and perish on the rocks of procrastination.

> I have long withstood His grace,
> Long provoked Him to His face,
> Would not hearken to His calls,
> Grieved Him by a thousand falls.

Ah, brethren, seize the opportunities given to you now, so that, when you come to die, you will be prepared to meet your Saviour, that, having become new creatures in Christ Jesus, you will receive an imperishable and incorruptible crown in the glorious kingdom above.

> Beyond this vale of tears
> There is a life above,
> Unmeasured by the flight of years,
> And all that life is love.

—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE.

SIR,—Some of your readers may not, perhaps, have seen an interesting article, by "S. G. G.", in the April number of the *Leisure Hour*. It is very instructive and full of encouragement to those who have been troubled by "oppositions of science falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi. 20). It is entitled, "The Last Thought of a Man of Science," and gives an account of the late Dr. Romanes, one of our most eminent men of science, and "one of the ablest expositors and advocates of the Darwinian theory of evolution." Dr. Romanes was a Cambridge University prizeman, an Oxford Professor, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and Zoological Secretary of the Linnæan Society. He was also well known as a writer, being the author of papers in the *Nineteenth Century* and the *Contemporary Review*, as well as of the interesting volume on "Animal Intelligence" in the International Scientific series. In his Cambridge Prize Essay he had maintained the efficacy of Christian prayer; but four years later, in 1878, Dr. Romanes published a work, in which he said: "The advance of science has now entitled us to assert, without the least hesitation, that the hypothesis of mind in nature is as certainly superfluous to account for any of the phenomena of nature as the scientific doctrine of the persistence of force and the indestructibility of matter is certainly true." "There can no longer be any more doubt that the existence of a God is wholly unnecessary to explain the phenomena of the universe, than there is doubt that, if I leave go of my pen, it will fall upon the table."

He thus contradicted Sir Isaac Newton, who may be termed the founder of modern science, and who thus closes his *magnum opus*, the "Principia": "This admirably beautiful structure of sun, planets, and comets could not have originated except in the wisdom and sovereignty of an intelligent and powerful Being. . . . . We know Him only by means of His properties and attributes, and by means of the supremely wise and infinite constructions of the world and their final causes. . . . . From a fluid metaphysical necessity, which of course is the same always and everywhere, no variety could originate. The whole diversity of created things in regard to places and times could have its origin only in the ideas and will of a necessarily existing Being."

Dr. Romanes added: "I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness. . . . . When I think at times, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of the creed which once was mine and the lonely mystery of existence as now I find it, at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible."

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, in his valuable book, "The Being of God," published by the S.P.C.K. in 1880, alluding to this utterance, observes: "Few will read these sad words without willingly joining with the writer of this note in prayer, that it may please God the Holy Ghost again to give to this able, yet erring, opponent the light he has now lost, and that he has the heart and the candour thus pathetically to deplore."

During the latter part of his life Dr. Romanes prepared a series of notes for a work which should contain his mature conclusions, and which should serve as a corrective to his former treatise. "It will surprise no one to learn," says Conon Gore, who has published these notes under the title of "Thoughts on Religion," "that the author of these 'Thoughts' returned, before his death, to that full deliberate communion with the Church of Jesus Christ which he had for so many years been conscientiously compelled to forego." In these "Thoughts" Dr. Romanes says: "I agree with Pascal that there is virtually nothing to be gained by being a Theist, as distinguished from a Christian." "Those who reject Christianity with contempt are those who care not for religion of any kind." "Not only is Christianity immeasurably in advance of all other religions; it is no less so of every system of thought that has ever been promulgated in regard to all that is moral and spiritual. . . . . It is certain that neither philosophy, science, nor poetry has ever produced results in thought, conduct, or beauty in any degree to be compared with it. This, I think, will be on all hands allowed as regards conduct. As regards thought and beauty it may be disputed. But consider, what has all the science or all the philosophy of the world done for the thought of mankind to be compared with the one doctrine 'God is Love'? Again, as regards beauty, the man who fails to see its incomparable excellence in this respect merely shows his own deficiency in the appreciation of all that is noblest in man. . . . . The entire story of the Cross, from its commencement in prophetic aspiration to its culmination in the Gospel, is by far the most magnificent in literature, and surely the fact of its having all been told does not detract from its poetic value. Nor does the fact of its being capable of appreciation by the individual Christian of to-day as still a vital religion detract from its sublimity. Only to a man destitute of spiritual perception can it be that Christianity should fail to appear the greatest exhibition of the beautiful, the sublime, and of all else that appeals to our spiritual nature, which has ever been known upon earth."

Long before Pascal had written, "Christianity is the only reasonable religion," and Dr. Johnson has said, "Christianity is the perfection of humanity"; while, more recently, Coleridge declared that "The Christian faith is the perfection of human intelligence." There is no real contradiction between Christianity and genuine science. The marvellous discoveries of science, if rightly interpreted, only confirm the message of Revelation. "In the advance of scientific knowledge, and of the critical art," says Mr. Gladstone, "I for one see much that corrects and chastens what was temporary or accidental in our persuasions concerning the subjects of belief, but nothing that disintegrates or undermines the basis of belief itself; much, on the contrary, that confirms it." And notably with regard to the great Creation story, by the only writer who has ever given mankind a reasonable account of their own origin, to be found on the first page of Holy Scripture, he has shown that the allegations of opponents are "not only untrue, but contradictory of the truth, inasmuch as science, when just principles of interpretation are called in, is found to have established what it has been charged with destroying" ("Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture," pp. 259, 263).

So science, by means of the spectroscope, has in recent years shown the material unity of the universe, as Newton, two centuries earlier, demonstrated its obedience to one paramount law; both these scientific discoveries confirming the original revelation as to the unity of the Creator, which had for many generations been safeguarded for the ultimate benefit of mankind by the despised Jew, while the heathen nations around were enslaved by the most degrading polytheistic nature-worship. So, too, the telegraph and the telephone afford suggestive illustrations of God's hearkening to prayer and of His government of the world. So also the vast geological æons, with their one foreordained progressive life-plan, slowly advancing to perfection, not only throw light on such texts as Ps. xc. 2 and Heb. i. 2, but make it easier for a reasonable faith to grasp something of God's "eternal purpose in Christ," Who is the Life (Eph. iii. 11, i. 10; John xiv. 6). "Nature is Christian," and, in a certain sense, "the soul is naturally Christian" also; hence Christianity alone explains the mysteries of the one, and alone satisfies the yearnings and the aspirations of the other. True science—which is only the Latin name for knowledge—will only point men more and more clearly to Christ, the Saviour of the world, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 3, 9).

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 13th, 1895.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Annesley, Rev. F. H., M.A., Rector of Clifford-Chambers; Vicar of Gayton, Staffordshire.

Askinson, Rev. C. Chetwynd, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Ashton-upon-Mersey; Acting Chaplain, Third Volunteer Battalion, Cheshire Regiment.

Bee, Rev. R., Curate-in-Charge of Glaisdale; Honorary Ruridecanal Secretary of the Church Army in the Deanery of Whitby.

Chevallier, Rev. John, M. ., Rector of Great Horwood, Winslow; Honorary S cr tary of the A.C.S. for Mursley Deanery.

Cole, Rev. William Gordon, M.A., Rector of Newbold Verdun, Leicestershire; Rural Dean of Sparkenhoe (First Deanery).

Cosens, Rev. W. R., D.D., Rector of St. Columba's, Crieff, N.B.; Rector of Moreton Say, Salop.

Cowling, Rev. David, Vicar of Riddlesden; Vicar of Gildersome, Leeds.

Dixon, Rev. John William, Association Secretary of the Church Missionary Society for Staffordshire; Vicar of St. James's, Wolverhampton.

Downing, Rev. William Andrews, M.A., Minor Canon of Llandaff Cathedral; Vicar of Caerwent-with-Llanfair, Discoed, Chepstow.

Emery, Rev. George, B.A., Curate; Rector of Penmaen, Swansea.

Farmer, Rev. James Edmund Gamul, M.A., Vicar of Arundel, Sussex; Rector of Bladon-cum-Woodstock, Oxon.

Fife, Rev. Edward C., Incumbent of Dunsford; Incumbent of Killaney, Diocese of Down.

Fleming, Rev. A. E., B.A., Curate of St. Catherine's, Gloucester; Chaplain of Gloucester Infirmary.

Fox, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Stroud; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Bisley Deanery.

Girdlestone, Rev. James Hammond Le Breton, M.A., Curate of Folkestone; Chaplain to the Devon House of Mercy, Bovey Tracy.

Goodwin, Rev. E. H., B.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class; Chaplain to the Forces, First Class.

Greenwood, Rev. H. F., M.A., Senior Curate; Vicar of St. John's, Park, Sheffield.

Hamilton, Rev. R. A., M.A., Vicar of Cranbourne, Windsor Forest; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Berks.

Hardy, Rev. Ernest W., Curate of Euston-with-Barnham, Suffolk; Rector of St. Mary's, Thetford, Norfolk.

Heber-Percy, Rev. H. V., B A., Rector of Moreton Say, Salop; Rector of St. Columba's, Crieff, N.B.

Hornby, Right Rev. Wilfrid Bird, D.D., formerly Bishop of Nyasaland; Rector of St. Clement's-with-St. Edmund's, Norwich.

Jackson, Rev. Blomfield, M.A., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Moorfields, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans; Secretary of the London Diocesan Home Mission.

King, Rev. Gilbert Alfred, M.A., Curate of Avebury; Vicar of Easterton, Devizes,

Kitson, Rev. E. B. B., M.A., Vicar of Northaw, Barnet; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Barnet Deanery.

Lathbury, Rev. C. E., Vicar of Aldborough Hatch, Ilford; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for S. Barking Deanery.

Lovett, Rev. R. D., B.A., Curate of Heysham, Lancashire; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Flintshire.

Moore, Rev. D. K., M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Hull; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Kingston-upon-Hull Deanery.

Morrison, Rev. Walter J., M.A., Senior Curate of Sheffield; Vicar of the New Parish of St. Peter, Abbeydale, Sheffield.

Onslow, Rev. Matthew R. S., M.A., R.N., Chaplain to the *Resolution*; Chaplain to the *Australia*.

Payne, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of Baldersby, Thirsk; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Thirsk Deanery.

Pentreath, Rev. A. G., M A.; Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.

Place, Rev. E W., B.A., Assistant-Missioner, Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol; Vicar of Cainscross, Gloucestershire.

Procter, Rev. L. J., M.A., Rector of Radwell, Baldock; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Baldock Deanery.

Pugh, Rev. George Augustus, M.A., Rector of Ashton-under-Lyne; Rural Dean of Ashton-under-Lyne.

Reade, Rev. G. E. P., M.A., Vicar of Skelsmergh, Kendal; Vicar of Milnthorpe.

Rees, Rev. W. D. W., Vicar of Barmby Moor; Honorary Ruridecanal Secretary of the Church Army for the Deanery of Pocklington.

Roe, Rev. A. R. E., late Rector of St. Peter's, Abaco; Assistant-Priest of St. Philip's, Mathew Town, Inagua, Diocese of Nassau.

Russell, Rev. William; Vicar of Norwell, Notts.

Selwyn, Rev. Herbert Edward, M.A., Rector of Stapleford; Rector of Bengeo, Herts.

Share, Rev. F. A. C., M.A., Rector of Linton, Skipton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.

Smith Rev. Reginald, M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Clifton; Vicar of Walpole St. Andrew's, Norfolk.

Somers, Rev. Annesley T., B.A, Incumbent of Cloydagh; Incumbent of Dunboyne, Diocese of Meath.

Swindell, Rev. Thomas Greenall, Vicar of Sedgeley, Dudley; Honorary District Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the Deanery of Himley.

Thomas, Rev. Llewellyn, M.A., Vice-Principal of Jesus College; Vicar of Holyhead.

Thompson, Rev. Cyril, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Mark's, Wrexham; Minor Canon of Winchester Cathedral.

Trelhearne, Rev. George H., B.A., R.N., Chaplain to the *Australia*; Chaplain to the *Resolution*.

Turner, Rev. George Wakefield, M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, Eldon, Sheffield; Secretary of the National Society for Sheffield Deanery.

Turner, Rev. Thomas Archer, M.A., Curate; Rector of Ickford, Bucks.

Voysey, Rev. Annesley Montagu, B A., Curate of Lower Brixham; Vicar of Morebath, Devonshire.

Ward, Rev. Charles Triffit, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Eastbourne; Vicar of St. Peter's, Colchester.

Waring, Rev. James, Curate of St Matthew's, Stepney; Vicar of Foxton, Market Harborough.

Watson, Rev. A. H., M.A., Rector of Nacton, Ipswich; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Colney Deanery.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hunt, Rev. Edward George, for twenty-three years Vicar of Bampton, Oxon, at Bournemouth, on the 18th inst., aged 70.

Slater, Rev. James, Vicar of Happisburgh-with-Walcot, at Happisburgh Vicarage, Norfolk, on the 12th inst., aged 78.

Tompson, Rev. Edward John, late Rector of Great Saxham, on the 19th inst., aged 65.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VOCATION OF A BISHOP.

By the Rev. CHARLES GORE, Canon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. John Percival, D.D., Lord Bishop of Hereford, on the Feast of the Annunciation.

"And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy Word."—St. Luke i. 38.

THE festival of Lady-day recalls to our memories the Annunciation of a high vocation made to a lowly Virgin of Nazareth, and her noble response to it. She meets it not without the alarm of awe-struck humility, the alarm which attends all mysterious and exceptional calls; but even more conspicuously with simple self-surrender. Nor do we notice only the humility and the self-surrender. Within that lowly Virgin there dwelt also the hero spirit, the sort of spirit which has dwelt in women who have been patriots and martyrs. The great hymn of the *Magnificat* expresses surely not only the humility and self-surrender of the saint, but a truly heroic joy, and such large views of the Divine purpose as would have grown in a soul nourished in the hope of Israel. A like awful humility, a like simple self-surrender, a like heroic joy and wide-spreading hope must animate to-day the soul of our brother whose response to God's high vocation and enabling gift we are gathered together this morning both to witness, and to fortify by our intercessions.

I.—It is a high vocation to be a Bishop, a chief pastor, both to feed and to rule the flock of Christ; it is a high vocation to maintain, under conditions which are continually changing, an unchanging standard of Apostolic truth and Apostolic discipline. Such a vocation may well tax the courage of the boldest. Yet the experience of history is full of encouragement.

> The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
> And God fulfils Himself in many ways,

but through all changes the Church of Christ has hitherto abundantly proved her title to the name of Catholic. She rooted herself first of all among the thoughts and institutions of the Roman Empire, so firmly, so, as it seemed, inextricably, that men from time to time have been disposed to regard her as nothing else than the product of the converging influences of that age. But the Roman Empire passed away; the hordes of barbarian invaders swept over her like the advancing waves of a great sea; a new world began, a world of Gothic, Lombard, and Frankish kingdoms. Yet the Christian Church was found to have knit itself as closely into the new order as into the old. We pass through the Middle Ages to the Renaissance. The Church in a great measure had proved unfaithful, she had forgotten the rock whence she was hewn and the hole of the pit whence she was digged. The cry of the Reformation was for a return to Christ and to His Apostles. It was a legitimate and necessary cry. But in England at least it took effect—not indeed without confusion or mistakes, but without any breach in the continuity of the Church. Since then the Church in England has passed through manifold vicissitudes; through the Rebellion and the Revolution; through the great weakening caused on the one hand by the withdrawal of the Non-Jurors, on the other by the policy of Walpole. She has passed through the dead period of the eighteenth century; she has witnessed the revivals associated with three great schools of thought within her own limits. The influences of these revivals have in large measure coalesced in the continually gathering strength of the Church of to-day. We should indeed be faithless if, in the light of such experiences in the past, we were to doubt the adaptability of our Creeds, our Scriptures, our moral principles, our ministerial succession, our sacramental ministries to the wants of the age that lies before us. That there are difficulties and dangers ahead who can doubt? But we consider the past, and we encourage one another. *O fortes peioraque passi.*

II.—But we must descend from the general to the particular. It would be foolish to deny that at the present moment the situation in rural England—and it is with rural England that the diocese of Hereford is almost exclusively concerned—as well from a religious as a social point of view, is full of difficulty. It may be said with truth that at the present moment the main battle of the Church is in the country districts. It is thence that the towns are fed; it is there alone that there is ecclesiastical organisation such as makes possible a really pastoral interest in every individual. Now at the present moment the country districts are both depressed in circumstances, and at the same time full of new expectations. Agricultural depression is in part the cause, and in part no doubt the effect, of the more capable and enterprising young men and women quitting the country for the towns. Meanwhile the new expectations do not render those that remain easier to deal with. While landowners and farmers are despondent, anxious about the future not without cause, and often irritated as they feel their old position passing away from them, the labourers have come to realise, as they never realised it

before, that things might be better with them] The new instrument of the Local Government Act is in their hands. They feel, with whatever degree of truth, that they have been trampled upon in the past, and used as instruments for the convenience of others. They are determined to see to their own interests now. That their hopes of better things are ultimately destined for a large measure of realisation we need not doubt. But, on the other hand, there must lie before them inevitably and antecedently a large measure of disappointment. They have no experience of self-government; they have been led to entertain extravagant hopes of what can be accomplished in the way of social reform; they must find, as all persons new to the work of reform must find, how many are the obstacles to any real improvement, how manifold are the conflicting interests—in a word, how slow is true progress. As we have lately been reminded, the man who is to do anything towards the bettering of the social state needs in equal measure enthusiasm and drudgery. But enthusiasm and drudgery are hard to combine, and still harder to sustain. Thus, there is sure to be a reaction from unreasonable expectations; and the reaction will bring with it suspicion: as now suspicion of the farmer and the squire (I am not yet speaking of the clergy), so a little later increased suspicion one of another, and of their new Radical and Socialist advisers.

Suspicion; let us dwell on that word. Tolstoi, in his novel of "Anna Karénine," makes a striking remark about the Russian peasants:—

> The principal obstacle which Levine (the landowner) found (in his scheme of co-operative farming) was the ingrained suspicion of the peasants; they could not realise that the proprietor was not intending to make capital out of them. Whatever arguments he advanced, they were convinced that his real aim was kept in the background. On their side they talked abundantly, but they were careful not to express what was at the bottom of their thoughts.

From all that we can learn, it would appear that this is a very general characteristic of the peasantry, a characteristic which has, I fear, only too much hold (and with too good reason) on the English peasantry also. They are suspicious of masters, leaders, advisers; they are suspicious one of another. Evidence of that, more than enough, has been already supplied to those who have tried to organise them in Agricultural Labourers' Unions. And they are suspicious of anything new. On the surface there may be Radical discontent with things as they are, even a desire to upset and reverse the present constitution of rural society. But if the Radicalism is apparent on the surface, below there is a deep fund of practical Conservatism. You have but to pass from what concerns the conduct of other people to what concerns the conduct of their own life, in order to find an unreasoning attachment to place, to custom, to tradition, an attachment which is the bewilderment of the economist and the despair of the reformer

Now these elements in the rural situation—a considerable breach of sympathy between the different classes in rural England; despondency, and to a certain degree resentment, on the part of farmers and land-owners; on the part of the labourers a determination to be no longer driven and exploited, coupled with inexperience, and, what is as important, a deep-rooted temper of suspicion, and a profound instinctive Conservatism—these elements, I say, make up a difficult situation. Meanwhile, an anxious question arises. The glory of the country has lain in the holy sanctified characters which are to be found especially among the aged peasantry. That pathetic indomitable patience, that humble and devout piety, that undaunted faith in the goodness of God, that recognition as of an obvious truth of a world beyond the grave where all things will be righted; as a consequence, that splendid courage and quietness in the face of death—this old religious spirit, of which the bad side is its fatalism, but which in its good side has its roots deep in the old order—will it persist? or are we to have at least an uncomfortable epoch of transition when the restlessness which accompanies the beginnings of change shall throw into the background the piety which grew in a period of more patient endurance?

It is with a situation of this kind that the Church in the present moment has to deal in the country districts, and in the Church pre-eminently the Bishop. But when I say the Bishop has to deal with it, I must mean, so it seems to me, that he has to deal with it mainly through his clergy. Very important is the direct relation of the Bishop to his laity. But in the main, and especially in rural districts, his influence must be through the clergy. He has to govern, to control, but still more, I think, to inspire, encourage, and help the country clergy. I name a class which of recent years have come in for not a little abuse. That they have had their faults it would be, indeed, idle to deny; that their kindness has been coloured with patronage, and their helpfulness not unaccompanied, at least from time to time, with an unwise and wrong desire to maintain the present relations of classes is certainly true. As a Church we have done much to comfort in the ordinary sense of the word, not enough to comfort in the original sense of the word—that is, to encourage to strength and freedom of action. But, without forgetting all this, I am, at the present moment, inclined to insist not on the faults of the rural clergy, but on their conspicuous excellences. In how many places, where good squires have been either lacking or absent, has the measure of civilisation attained in the country been largely dependent on the parson and his family? Again, on the whole, what a noble element in the life of our country has been the country parsonage. Where has the struggle with straitened means been

borne so nobly, so uncomplainingly, with so little loss of refinement or of power? It needs but a little experience of our Universities to feel how large a part of what is best, most honourable, and simplest in young England comes out of the homes of the country clergy. Where else has there been so systematic an exhibition of the Christian service of the poor in things spiritual and in things corporal, undertaken as an obvious duty, or with a deep sense of pleasure and interest, and without any sense of merit or expectation of worldly reward? Thus, I say, there is no class which more needs and merits encouragement. They need it. In the town a clergyman has a great deal to encourage him. At the worst his flock is very large, and there are a number of different streams of life; a distinction manifests itself between good and bad; there is almost always enough vigorous goodness to give him heart and interest; and while not every one can be looked after, the untouched mass is lightened in the foreground by a group of men or women, boys or girls, who exhibit growth, fruitfulness, and response to effort. But in a country parish everybody can be known, ought to be known—known as an individual from his childhood upwards. The parishioners are not too many to lie individually on the pastor's conscience. Distinctions emerge among them much less than in towns, especially much less among the young. Nowhere is the tyranny of tradition, the terror of public opinion so strong. There is a paralysing fear of doing anything new or surprising; hence a tendency towards a dead level of moral inadequacy; endless disappointments in promising school children or confirmation candidates. Meanwhile the pastor finds very little of spiritual or intellectual companionship for himself. There is very little to lift him out of the ordinary routine of country life. The temptation is to become, if not nowadays the hunting parson, then, what is no better, the lawn-tennis parson. Efforts are relaxed; the daily services that ought without doubt, according to the mind of the Prayer-book, to be maintained as services of intercession for the parish, even if the parish sends few or no representatives to join in them, are found to be depressing. They are, wrongly no doubt, given up. Confirmation candidates are irresponsive to efforts at systematic teaching, and the systematic teaching becomes less careful in consequence. The choir is troublesome and disappointing, so it is left to take its chance. Visiting, if it is found to give pleasure, is found to cause jealousy too; and that is an excuse for failing in diligence here also. And over it all the material difficulties of very narrow means spread a depressing atmosphere.

Well then, I say, it is in putting heart into the country clergy that the main privilege and opportunity of the Bishop of a rural diocese must lie. May I be pardoned if I speak of some ways in which such enheartenment may be hoped for, partly through our existing machinery, partly by additions to it? Many of those to whom I am speaking here in this Abbey church are probably weary of endless meetings; the very suggestion of a meeting strikes a chill. But with the country clergy the great need is to promote meeting, to promote intercourse, where spiritual interests and spiritual duties are in prominence; where effort may be stimulated by discussion. The Bishop must set himself to put life and reality into the diocesan conferences, into the ruridecanal meetings, into diocesan retreats or quiet days, into everything that can bring about the sense of brotherhood and fellowship among the clergy in spiritual effort. And it must not be forgotten that the English Church, alike in town and country, is at present accursed with a mere parochialism. Every parish, then, must be stimulated to recognise its diocesan and its Catholic interests, to recognise that it is a part of that organic whole, the diocese, and part in such sense of the Catholic Church with its missionary obligations, that no parish priest can be doing his duty who is not interesting his people in some one branch of the Church's foreign Mission work. But above all the Bishop must remember how much depends upon the spirit which he brings into his personal visits to the different clergy. He ought to be known to the diocese; he must be known and accessible to the clergy; he must delight to visit them in their own homes and parishes. St. Paul is a magnificent example of sympathy. He had his own great burden to bear, the burden of ill-health and physical disqualifications; the burden of personal controversy as regarded his own apostolate; the burden of theological labour; the burden—"that which came upon him daily—the care of all the Churches." But he had his own burden so well in hand that the large spaces in his heart were free to bear the burdens of other people. "Who is weak and I am not weak? Who is offended and I burn not?" That that was no idle boast we know from the accuracy of his memory for persons, that accuracy of memory, that fulness of sympathy which is conspicuous in the salutations of his different Epistles. And sympathy, effective sympathy, let us all remember, is much more the growth of moral effort than it is a gift of nature. A Bishop, then, must study the moral art of sympathy. He must be ready to listen to an old story of parochial difficulties; he must go into details; he must pray with his clergy in their own homes, for their own needs and the needs of their people; he must talk about the schools; he must strive to reconcile differences, not only among classes, but among persons. When occasion offers he must be ready with a discipline as severe as was shown in the diocese of Hereford of old time by St. Thomas Cantilupe or Richard Swinfield. But at all times he must be ready with a forbearance, with a patience which looks to no example lower than the

example of the forbearance and the patience of God.

May I add a word about the employment of additional means in the work of country parishes? Surely the clergy need to be encouraged to a freer use of Gospel instruments; surely out-of-door services ought to be more frequent; surely the use of such an instrument as the Litany at Rogation-tide chanted through the parishes, among the houses, the gardens, the fields, in solemn procession, not of the choir only, but of the representative men of the parish, might be far more commonly used. Once more, do we not need deliberate conference as to the best way to restore the service of the Eucharist to its true place in Christian worship and brotherhood, as regards the best kinds of village missions, and as regards the best way to introduce the elements of freshness into the teaching of the Faith? But if Diocesan Missioners are to become a permanent and successful institution, surely a great deal of care is needed that they do not get the position, and excite the jealousy consequent to the position, either of Episcopal inquisitors or Episcopal favourites. Last, but not least, must we not set ourselves as a Church, both by prayer, by consultation, and by action, to bring it about that the beneficed clergy should not be left for indefinitely long periods to stagnate in parishes where they gradually cease to do any good?

III.—It is easy to say these things, hard to accomplish them. But our religious peril is a quiescent fatalism. We see it among the uneducated. We go into this or that poor man's house; we hear that it has "pleased God to take" so and so—that is, by death—in cases where it is at least half the truth that it pleased the man himself to go long before God intended that he should, through some form of sensual indulgence, or it pleased us to send him into the other world by putting him under conditions where he could not possibly live. The poor lay things on God which are contrary to His will through a pious phrase. In more educated classes we talk more learnedly of the laws of nature, or of the tendencies of heredity, or of political economy, but with no less practical fatalism. And the folly is observable not less in us clergy. But we of all men need most conspicuously to live in full face of divine ideals, and in constant determination to see to it that at least they shall be on their way to realisation. The Apostles were called "the men who have turned the world upside down."

Have I been guilty of impertinence in speaking thus freely out of what is at best a small experience? If so, may the tradition of freedom in this ancient Abbey be in part my excuse, and in part the needs of the case; for we none of us can doubt that the truest defence of the Church lies in the rendering her spiritually effective and truly pastoral, lies in bringing it about that, with a holy impartiality of love, she shall touch all classes and belong to none.

And here I draw to an end. There are two considerations making for hopefulness which recur continually to my mind. First, that the country remains the country, and in manifold ways gives, by comparison to the town, a great advantage to religion. At least, in the long run, the relation of classes towards one another, and at all times the relation of men to physical nature, are there more natural, and it was not for nothing that our Lord drew from the ordinary spectacles of nature so large a part of His teaching about the divine kingdom. There, in the quiet and silence of the country, there is more room for God. We feel that in the long run the country and piety cannot be separated. If at times there is a strain in their relation, the peasantry and the clergy must be natural friends. There are types of pious character which live in our memory such as the country tends to produce at the worst of times. George Crabbe was a terrible realist, but he copied from the life the figure of "the noble peasant." Gray was an idealist, but his idealism of the country churchyard is an idealism of sentiment which springs from the heart of facts, and belongs to the country churchyard for no other reason than its relation to the human life which lies round about it. In more modern times our truest peasant poet found his highest inspiration in "The Church an' happy Zunday."

Once again we find it a continual source of encouragement to reflect on the pathetic realities of human nature, and the exquisite adaptation of the provision which God has made for them in His Church. "Only the infinite pity is adequate to the infinite pathos of human life." And the pathos of human life is more apparent in the country, as the individuals stand out there more markedly. There is the manifest need, the conscious or unconscious hunger of human nature for God; and on the other hand the rich provision of the "bread of life" in the "household of God," the "portion of meat for each in due season." How expressive, how specially expressive in the country, is the provision of grace for each vicissitude of human life—the infant baptism, the confirmation of the growing soul, the regular Communion, the fellowship of all classes in common worship, the celebration of matrimony, the much-regarded thanksgiving after childbirth, the restoration of the penitent, the ministering to the sick, the burial of the dead. Yes, we contemplate the hunger of human souls and the harvest of God's provision, and transferring the prayer from things physical to things spiritual, we hopefully pray:—

> Mighty One in heaven, Who carvest
> The sparrow's meat,
> Bid the hunger and the harvest
> Come together, we entreat.

And if, in view of all this moral requirement of your ministry, you, our brother, soon to be our

father in God, tremble before the great claim, shall we not, can we not encourage you? "How shall these things be?" was the cry of the Virgin Mary. "Who is sufficient for these things?" is yours, and the answer in both cases is the same, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee." You have behind you, as all can bear witness, the assurance of repeated realisations that "according to thy need so shall thy strength be"; adequate as you have shown yourself to the exacting requirements of great schools, and to the not smaller requirements of a vigorous college, you embark, no doubt, now on an unaccustomed sort of work; yet God's faithfulness in the past is the pledge of the adequacy of His gifts in the future. We watch to-day while the Holy Ghost is given to you, "the gift" that shall be "in thee by the laying-on of hands"; and what God gives thee is "not the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and discipline."

CHURCH WORKERS.

By the Rev. J. WORTHINGTON-ATKIN, M.A.

Sermon Preached in St. Peter's Church, Cork, on Sunday, March 31st, 1895.

"And He said, 'Certainly I will be with thee.'"—Exodus iii. 12 (part of.)

ON last Tuesday we had our annual Church-workers' meeting in the city of Cork, and the object of that association is to bind together our workers, to give them a more conscientious view of their work, to help them to understand and comprehend the great responsibility resting on them, and to show those who are engaged in what we may regard as humble work that if they are doing it for God's glory they are Church-workers from the highest and purest motives. The two lessons to-day, especially the first, suggest these thoughts, and as every person ought to be a Church-worker in some way or other, doing something for God, I think it a very suitable subject. Our text then is, "Certainly I will be with thee." Now God called Moses to do a certain work for Him, and I am perfectly sure God calls many persons to do work for Him, but it is my experience that it would sometimes be much pleasanter to do it than to be coaxing people who don't seem to realise the great and glorious privilege and responsibility of being called by God for His Church and cause. I want to point out very definitely what I find in the Word of God—that when Moses was called to work for God he made five excuses. Now the first excuse we have in the 11th verse, "And Moses said unto God, Who am I." Well, of course, there is a sense of weakness about it which is very right and praiseworthy, for who was Moses that he should undertake this great and all-important work of bringing five millions of God's people out of Egypt to the Promised Land of Canaan; and no wonder that he said "Who am I," that I should undertake this. And I tell you why Moses said it—he had a sad chapter in his life which, if I mistake not, many workers have had in their own experience—Moses went to work before he was called; he undertook to do what God did not ask him to do—I refer to the well-known incident when Moses, seeing the affliction of his friend, went out and delivered him—and failure and defeat met him. "And it came to pass in those days when Moses was grown that he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens; and he spied an Egyptian smiting an Hebrew, one of his brethren. And he looked this way and that way, and when he saw that there was no man"—that's not the way to do God's work, but it is the way many people do it now—"he slew the Egyptian, and hid him in the sand. And when he went out the second day, behold two men of the Hebrews strove together; and he said to him that did the wrong, Wherefore smitest thou thy fellow? and he said," very properly, "Who made thee a prince and a judge over us? intendest thou to kill me as thou killest the Egyptian? And Moses feared and said, Surely this thing is known." Dear friends, until God calls us and sends us forth to work we have no right to undertake it. Moses undertook work that God did not call him to, therefore defeat and failure met him at every side, and his conduct in hiding that poor man in the sand, lest his neighbours should hear of it, is a dark spot in his history. No wonder when God said, "Come, I will send thee," that he answered, "Who am I," for he appreciated the awful responsibility and difficulty of the great work God called him to do. And if God has called us to work, we should feel conscious of the difficulties and responsibilities, for how difficult it is to bring a soul from darkness to light, from the broad way that leadeth to everlasting destruction to the narrow way that leadeth to life eternal, from bondage to freedom; but we have the solution of the whole dificulty in the text, "Certainly, I will be with thee." Oh, if we are doing our work in a formal way, we may be sure that defeat and failure will meet us, but if we go forth in the name of God, and under the power and influence of the Holy Ghost, we may be perfectly sure God will bless His own work. But God removed this difficulty; yet Moses had another one. We have it in verse 13: "And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is His name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM." Do you see how beautifully the Church has cole lected our lessons? I often admire the choic-made in the selection of our Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels. In the first Lesson we have God

revealing Himself as "I AM," while in the second we have Jesus saying "I am," thereby showing the combination between the nature of God and Jesus, showing Jesus is God. Oh, friends, when we go to people we must have a very definite message, for there is no room for speculation, and our minds must be fully made up. I am perfectly sure why many people engaged in God's work do not meet with more success is because they themselves are not fully persuaded of the great verities of the Christian religion, and therefore, when I preach dogmatically to you, and lay down certain facts as I find them in the Bible, it is because I believe God would have His ministers first understand the teaching of His word, and then without hesitation to dogmatise and lay down that which is written in the Word of God. Now the great message God gave His servant Moses was "I am," and He that spake was no ordinary messenger, for as we read in the Acts of the Apostles he was the "Angel of the Lord"—the Lord Jesus Christ Himself—Who in the second Lesson says "I am," thus bringing us from the New Testament to the Old, and applies to Himself this name, "I am," and not only applies it but elaborates and works out the idea in detail. Christ says, "I am the Way;" Christ shines and dispels darkness, "I am the Light;" if we need spiritual nourishment to the soul Christ says, "I am the Vine;" if we long to enter into heaven, "I am the Door;" and by-and-bye when we are laid in the grave Christ says, "I am the Resurrection;" we too have spiritual life, "I am the Life;" if we need sustenance for the soul, "I am the Bread of Life;" if we are prone to wander, "I am the Good Shepherd;" when darkness comes over us, "I am the bright and morning Star;" and He sums it all up by saying, "I am Jesus!" Oh, Church-workers, this message we must be able to tell to sinners—to point them to Jesus—and unless we know Him through personal dealings and contact we have no message to tell. And now mark Moses' third excuse, the 4th chapter and 1st verse, "But behold they will not believe me," and I am not surprised at that. In the first place the people might not believe that God had called Moses at all to the work; secondly, they might not believe that God had given Moses a message; and, thirdly, they would refuse to believe that the Great Jehovah appeared in a burning bush. Moses wants to know whether the people will believe this or not, so God gives Moses a proof of his Divine mission. "And the Lord said unto him, What is that in thine hand? And he said, 'A rod.' And He said, Cast it on the ground," and he did so, 'and it became a serpent, and Moses fled from before it." And God says, "Take it by the tail, don't hesitate, draw nigh," and he did so. No matter what opportunities we have, no matter what God has given us, if we will but cast it at the foot of Jesus we will see what God is able to do with it. He will make our privileges not to be something to be frightened at or that we may not touch, but something to dedicate to Him, and which we will get the entire mastery and control over. There is one word marked here, the little word "A," "A rod," and this indefinite article is changed to the definite "the," "the rod." "*A* rod" becomes "*the* rod" of God, and we say to workers who wish to do any work for Jesus, "your talents which are indefinite" dedicate to God's service, and cast them at the feet of your Saviour, and God will sanctify and bless these talents, and every talent will become a talent of opportunity and privilege—a rod of the Lord God Almighty. Oh, yes, God does call Moses, and does give to him an opportunity for working and labouring. And now Moses puts forward a fourth objection (4th chapter and 10th verse). And Moses said unto the Lord, "Oh, my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore nor since Thou hast spoken unto Thy servant, but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue." Now, how often we hear people say when they are asked to do anything for God, "don't ask me to talk or speak, I am not able to," and I often wonder at this, because, as a rule, we Irish people are not at a loss to talk. We can talk politics, or discuss our grievances, or speak about how we are going to spend the coming season, and one hundred and one other things, but we cannot ever speak a word for Jesus. Well, Moses thought he would not do, but God, who called him to the work, gave him words, and I am sure if we will ask God He will tell us what to say. You remember in the 1st chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we read that when the Holy Ghost came down they were to be witnesses for Jesus, and you and I by our lives, words, and conversations ought to witness and speak for our Blessed Lord and Master. Surely, we would think Moses was satisfied now, for he does not now deny that there is need for his work, or that it ought to be done; but what does he say in the 13th verse?

Fifth (and last) objection, "Oh, my Lord, send, I pray Thee, by the hand of him whom Thou wilt send." He would say I know it is an immense work to go down and bring up the children of Israel, and an urgent work, and one which some one ought to do, but I will give the opportunity to anybody that is willing, only don't ask me. It is a common excuse. Some people say Sunday-school is a grand thing for children, and time ought to be found to look after the absent ones; have good teachers, but don't ask me to take a class. Others say district visiting is a good thing, and some one ought to look after people and make them go to church; but don't ask me, I am not called to that work, and those people who are enthusiastic and earnest want to do all they can for God's work by proxy or deputy, and those

who do not engage in the work are very often the keenest critics themselves. Moses said, "Send whom Thou wilt, but don't send me." I am not willing, but get it done by another person. Ah, friends! do you recognise what a grand and glorious privilege it is to do something for the Master; and I would ask those of you who love Jesus—and there are many here—those who are anxious to see souls gathered in, those who look for an endless eternity to be willing to do the work yourselves if God calls you, and if I ask you to do some work for God, receive it as a call from Him as He works in this parish through me. Those who are anxious for the spread of the Master's Kingdom should remember that God can answer every objection as He did those of Moses. Oh let Moses' words never be yours, "Lord, send whom Thou wilt but not by me," but say to Jesus, "Here I am, what wilt Thou have me to do?"

O use me Lord, even me!
Just as Thou wilt, and when and where,
Until at last Thy face I see;
Thy rest, Thy joy, Thy glory share.

ABSTRACT OF ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PEACE SOCIETY, 1895.—The annual report of the Peace Society, 47, New Broad Street, London, E.C., states that the Society has been kept in touch, as far as possible, with every movement that has tended to advance its object—the promotion of peace "upon the basis of Christian principles." It has maintained a varied correspondence, and an alertness in all matters relating to the promotion and maintenance of peace. It has endeavoured to keep itself in contact with all peace workers everywhere. Through its Bureau in Paris it has kept prominent the idea of arbitration and exercised a perceptible influence where it was most needed. It has also assisted in the work of keeping the Peace Societies of the Continent, the number of which is constantly increasing, in vital association with each other. Through the Arbitration Alliance, to whose varied and useful work it has rendered what assistance it could, it has stimulated the union of the Christian Churches, which form the most potent factor of all in propagating the Gospel of Peace, and establishing the Kingdom which is peace and righteousness. The Committee have, as usual, done much to secure the success of the annual Peace Sunday. Upwards of 13,000 invitations to preach sermons on that day in favour of peace were sent out to ministers and churches, the majority direct from the office, although a large number was sent through friends and helpers in all parts of the country. More than 80,000 papers and pamphlets were sent out, in response to applications, for the occasion, showing a much wider observance of the Sunday than even last year. One gratifying feature was the number and sympathetic tone of the notices in the Press. The Secretary has directed special attention to the delivery of addresses to colleges and schools during the year. And for the young in particular a valuable similar service has been rendered by the various sets of magic-lantern slides, which have been prepared by the Society at considerable expense. A very large issue of pamphlets and tracts has been made by the Society, and it has organised as usual its lectures and public meetings in various parts of the kingdom.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 1, 1895.

OPIUM *SINE DIGNITATE.*

WHAT causes the difficulty of dealing with a faddist is the '*mens conscia recti*,' which cases the good man in oak and three-fold brass of self-sufficiency. He thinks the question settled because he has made up what he is pleased to call his mind, and those who fail to follow him are either insincere or unintelligent.

In England we are inclined to be tolerant, indeed over-tolerant, with these excellent people. Abroad they get short shrift. But the faddist is only the natural outcome of the English temperament. We like making up our own minds, we are apt to be dogmatic, and we are certainly fond to excess of impressing our own opinions on other people. These are the characteristics of an imperial race, and the vagaries of the faddist are their abortive fruit when misdirected and improperly applied. We cannot help being tender to those who sin after our own image, so to speak.

This is the reason why public opinion has so long borne with the Anti-Opium Society, a society, by the way, which would only be possible in England. The ladies and gentlemen (in giving deserved priority to the ladies we chivalrously resist the claims of the adjective "old") who compose this society have long made up their minds to these fallacies:—

1. That the consumption of opium, in any and every form, is fatal to the inhabitants of China (and India in brackets.)

2. That the Chinese (and natives of India in brackets) are aware of this, and long to be delivered from the poisonous scourge.

3. Which is not cultivated in China.

4. But the perfidious Indian Government pro-

motes the cultivation of the drug in India and compels its importation into China.

5. And that, in consequence, the inhabitants of two continents are corrupted and demoralised in order to make an Indian Budget.

The propaganda of the Anti-Opium Society is based upon these extraordinary conclusions. Granting their truth, all the proceedings of the society are fully justified. But there lies the rub. Not one of these conclusions rests upon satisfactory evidence. They depend upon preconceived opinions and pious beliefs, and, at best, upon haphazard and insufficient observations of the kind of persons least qualified to form unbiassed judgments, *e.g.*, missionaries. But these have been quite enough to keep the society going for many years. With true British self-sufficiency, they have set aside climatic and racial peculiarities, and the whole wide world of difference in thought and feeling and custom and tradition, to say nothing of religion, which lies between East and West. They have clamoured persistently for what amounts to the suppression of an ancient and widespread usage and the extinction of a profitable industry on no other grounds than the *ipse dixit* of a small body of private individuals, who are almost wholly ignorant of the ins and outs of the question which they gratuitously propose to settle off-hand.

The last concession made to these singular philanthropists was the Opium Commission, which was appointed some time ago to look into the whole thing. We hasten to admit that some of the anti-opiumists did not want it looked into. They had made up their own minds, and saw no necessity for collecting any further information. But the most part of them thought otherwise. They were well represented on the Commission, they were satisfied about its impartiality, and were prepared to advance to it the commendation of Providence, of which, we are to understand, the Anti-Opium Society holds the monopoly.

Several thousands of pounds have been spent upon this Commission which, after an exhaustive enquiry, has reported dead against the anti-opiumists. The whole Commission, barring one extreme anti-opiumist, and including more than one who came to the enquiry with a strong bias in that direction, have reported that, in effect, the Anti-Opium Society is as wrong as it could be, and that every one of its conclusions is opposed to facts. Opium is largely cultivated in China, which could and would supply its own needs the moment the Indian supply were cut off. The consumption of opium is not repugnant to Oriental feeling, nor contrary to law, nor productive of mischief. And so on, and so on. It is not too much to say that the report simply rakes and riddles the anti-opium position. The sequel shows the admirable impenetrableness of the British faddist. Sir Joseph Pease and his fellows straightway occupy a night in the House of Commons in moving what amounts to a vote of censure on the Commissioners. First they deny that they ever wanted the Commission, in spite of the enthusiasm with which they bespoke for it, not only their own, but the Divine benediction. Then they go on to say, in plain language, that the enquiry was bogus, that the evidence was faked, and the report cooked in the India Office. Finally they contend that the personal opinions of a few private individuals in England are worth a great deal more than the direct evidence of hundreds of qualified witnesses in India. It is going almost too far even for a faddist. There is a blatant conceit about Sir Joseph Pease's contention which it is well-nigh impossible even for the English nation to tolerate or condone. For the claim is nothing else than this, that in the matter in hand the Commission do not know, and the officials do not know, and the doctors do not know, and the natives themselves do not know, and, in fact, the only persons who do know anything at all are the Anti-Opium Society, and what they do not know is not worth knowing. These modest persons are superior to all ordinary means of information, and safe against all vulgar risks of error. This must be a great consolation to them. Meanwhile the plain man in the street feels an altogether irreverent impulse to do something severe to the omniscient and infallable Sir Joseph. The freest toleration has its limits, and Sir Joseph Pease has overstepped them in his impertinent criticism of the labours of the Commission, and his insulting personal attack on eight out of nine members who composed it. In the House this impulse had its way and resulted in a most severe snubbing. Unhappily, in men of Sir Joseph's kidney the total effect of a snub is nil, it has to be accompanied by a kick to be of any practical value. In the country it is different, and it is much to be wished that the report of the Opium Commission, followed by the exposure of the Anti-Opium Society, will lay the whole question at rest for our generation.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE Primate's recommendation that the Prayer for Unity in the Accession Service shall be said everywhere on Whitsun Day has received the support of the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, the Bishops of Durham, Exeter, Llandaff, Lichfield, Manchester, Peterborough, Ripon, St. Davids, Sodor and Man, Wakefield and Worcester; of Archdeacons Farrar (Dean-designate of Canterbury) and Sinclair; and Canons Scott Holland and Wilberforce. Among the ministers of other religious bodies who approve of the suggestion are the Moderators of the Established and Free Churches of Scotland, the Chairmen of the Congregational and Baptist Unions, and the President of the Wesleyan Conference. The leaders of the smaller Methodist bodies also concur.

This is altogether in accordance with the spirit of the Pope's letter on Re-union, but the head of the Roman Catholic Church in England does not seem to have authorised his clergy to say the prayer. There is nothing in its wording, so far as an outsider can judge, that need prevent them doing so, if authority were given by their ecclesiastical superiors.

The Bishop of Durham, in a circular letter on the subject to the clergy and laity of his diocese, says the desire for the re-union of Christendom, which at present fills many hearts and finds expression in unexpected ways, must be welcomed by all as the voice of God to His people. They may not be able to see at present how the desire can be accomplished, but they believe it answers to God's will, which cannot fail in the end.

The Bishop of London has authorised the Rev. H. Wilson, St. Augustine's, Stepney, to use a special prayer for unity after the "Gloria in Excelsis" at the celebration of the Holy Communion. The prayer is one in use among the members of the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom. The *Church Times* says that in the diocese of Chichester it has been the custom for several years past, at the particular wish of the Bishop, to read the Prayer for Unity in the Accession Service at the close of morning and evening service on Sundays.

The Rev. J. W. Ayre, the vicar of St. Mark's, North Audley Street, at which the now famous interrupted marriage took place, has at length broken his silence on the subject, and to good purpose. Mr. Ayre says that he refused to take the service himself, or to allow his organist or choir to take any part in it. Neither they, nor either of the curates, nor Mr. Ayre were present, and every penny of the fees was handed over to parish purposes. Mr. Ayre adds :—"No one can more heartily wish for an alteration of the law than I do, but until we have succeeded in getting it altered (always supposing a clergyman can be found willing to officiate), our course, in my opinion, is to stand aside and let the law of the land take its course, rather than resort to such childish measures as locking the church doors against the wedding party.

Among the deaths announced this week is that of Bishop Suter, whose excellent work as Bishop of Nelson, in New Zealand, is better remembered by an older than by the rising generation of Churchmen. It is true that he resigned his episcopate only five years ago, after an incumbency of twenty-five years, but it was in the earlier part of his administration that his labours were most conspicuous as well as most arduous. He was, before his consecration, curate of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, and incumbent of All Saints', Mile End.

The new Bishop of Zanzibar will be the Rev. William Moore Richardson, M.A., Vicar of Ponteland, Newcastle-on-Tyne, who has been nominated by the Universities Mission. The Bishop-designate was educated at Rossall School and at Merton College, Oxford. He began his clerical career in 1869, under Canon Body at Wolverhampton ; from 1876-9 he was Second Master at All Saints' School, Bloxham ; and subsequently he was on the teaching staff of the Missionary College at Dorchester (Oxon). He is a decided High Churchman, and a member of the E.C.U. and the C.B.S.

The trouble which has arisen over the consecration of Señor Cabrera as Bishop of the Spanish Reformers seems likely to be repeated in Italy. Count Campello, who seceded from Rome a few years ago, and is desirous of founding a Reformed Catholic Church in Italy, has made many converts, and his friends are desirous that he should receive episcopal consecration. It is stated that the Swiss Old Catholic Bishops are prepared to consecrate him, though they refused their help to Señor Cabrera, but that announcement is possibly a little premature. The Archbishop of Dublin will probably come to the rescue in case of need. Nothing will be done, however, until enough money has been raised to provide the Bishop with an income of £250 a year.

The annual conference of Anglican chaplains in Northern and Central Europe, appointed to take place at Boulogne this month, is not to be held, as previously announced, in the Council Chamber of the Hôtel de Ville, the Mayor, Dr. Douglas Aigre, having withdrawn his permission. The action of the Mayor is chiefly due to the nature of one of the subjects proposed for discussion, "The Best Means of Meeting the Present Aggressiveness of Roman Catholicism." The Roman Catholics and a number of English Churchmen, there and elsewhere, having signified their disapproval at the matter being debated in a French town as tending to engender ill-feeling, it has been considered desirable to change the subject, and the paper will be replaced by one on "The Validity of Anglican Orders."

Another projected ecclesiastical gathering, of a more pretentious character, is not to come off. There will be no Church Congress in Ireland this year. The meeting was to have been held at Derry, but the Protestants of that city objected to the names of some prominent English Ritualists who had been invited, and, as their feeling was pretty generally shared in the Irish Church, the Bishop, Dr. Alexander, has deemed it better to abandon the Congress than, in plain words, to have a row. Probably it was the best thing to be done.

A clergyman is very much exercised as to whether he can lawfully use extemporary prayers on any occasion, in the face of the declaration which he has made that in public prayer and the administration of the Sacraments he will use the form provided in the Book of Common Prayer, "and none other." The answer seems to be that extemporary prayer may not be used in the ordinary worship of the Church, but the rubric never contemplated the numerous irregular services now held, and held with so much advantage, in mission rooms and other unconsecrated buildings. In such cases a clergyman is doubtless free to pray in his own words if he thinks fit to do so.

But it is really a comfort in these days to find anybody anxious to do only what is lawful. Some clergy disobey the rubric by using in public worship prayers which are not in the Prayer-Book, while the disobedience of a good many more takes the form of omitting some which are directed to be said. The omission of prayers from the ordinary morning service, for example, which is now so common, is unrubrical, probably illegal, and we doubt whether it commends itself to the ordinary lay church-goer.

From extemporary prayer to extemporary preaching. Preachers without book should keep their sentences well in hand, and always be ready to pull up (it was Bishop Wilberforce's saying) at any word. The remark is quoted by "Peter Lombard," of the *Church Times*, who enforces it with one of his capital stories. The curate of Wyezedton was addressing his con-

gregation on New Year's Eve. He turned to different classes of his hearers, "And you old men with your hoary head," etc. Then, addressing the young men, he said, "And you young men with your blooming cheek—ahem! I mean with the bloom still upon your cheek." But it was too late. The "blooming cheek" of the young men of Wyezedton has become a standing joke.

Some excitement has been caused at Southampton by the baptism of a child at St. Luke's Church in that town according to the form prescribed in the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., the optional use of which the Ritualists desire to have authorised. A report of the ceremonial says that the Rev. Bruce Cornford, curate-in-charge, was the officiating priest, assisted by Mr. Staden, as acolyte, while the choir were in attendance, and were headed in procession and recession by the processional cross. The first part of the service was conducted at the church door, where the infant received the sign of the cross both on the forehead and breast. The baptism was performed by immersion.

A correspondent writes :—The Church at the West End has often helped the Church at the East, but in the North and North-west of London it has often been lamented that many of the poorer and overcrowded districts have received but little aid from their more fortunate neighbours. At last, however, there seems to be a movement in this part of London, and the Vicar of All Hallows, North St. Pancras, the Rev. C. Mackeson, who, with the full sanction and support of the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Marlborough, is making a vigorous effort to put the roof on the fine church which Mr. James Brooks is building, has received some pleasant promises of help from his clerical brethren.

The humours of the Disestablishment campaign steadily accumulate. Somebody, the *Record* reports, has found a good Calvinistic Methodist who has been shocked beyond expression at finding he has signed a petition against the Welsh Bill when he merely supposed himself to be gambling frugally by entering for a raffle. Somebody else has found a Liberationist who knows the clergy are State-paid because he finds in the Estimates a large sum down for "Her Majesty's Ministers."

The Pope's Letter, though its kindly spirit is almost universally appreciated, seems to have extinguished any hope of re-union with Rome even among those Churchmen who are most anxious for it. What Lord Halifax thinks of it we have not heard, but Canon Carter is quite explicit. "No one," he writes, "can possibly see under our present circumstances the slightest sign leading us to suppose re-union with Rome possible. Subjection to Roman claims, as now urged, is to my mind a simple impossibility, and would be a denial of the results of a long life's constant study to ascertain the truth on the questions that divide us."

There is no law which requires that churchwardens must have been confirmed ; we are afraid that even baptism could not be legally insisted upon. A curious incident occurred the other day at a confirmation in the diocese of Durham. Both the churchwardens, having been admitted to their office without that ordinance, presented themselves as candidates, along with the juveniles of the parish. All who had received the imposition of hands were afterwards invited to the vicarage to tea, where they were joined by the Bishop.

WHAT IS LIFE?

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., stated :—

Life is manifested by a peculiar action or power working in matter, causing movements which excite growth and sensation ; further rising, as to man, into thought, emotion, the sense of responsibility and of spiritual joys. It appears in a structureless, semi-fluid matter, bioplasm, and in no other.

The life-point is a nucleus which forms to itself a cell-wall of bioplasm, and every animal and plant is a sum of vital unities, the characteristics of general life, and the specific characters of its own life as it advances to maturity. We cannot detect any difference marking off higher from lower life, nor in the embryonic bioplasm separating it from that of the adult creature.

Life is a scene of conflict, but the victory more than compensates for the battle. In low grades of existence, pain, having no fret of anticipation with it, turns in every case to some present or future advantage ; even death ministers to more and further. Nature is not to be painted in shadow, but should be thought and spoken of as a grand parable.

Our threefold state of life—body, soul, spirit—was from the beginning (Job xxxiii. 4 ; Ps. cxxxix. 13-16). Incidentally physical science even proves our Divine origin ; for as every phenomenon of the inorganic world is the product of adequate causes traced to the Eternal Power, so, and more specially, life. The life-point secretes a substance and forms a cell as medium of intercourse with the surroundings. The cell is at once separating and connecting. The nucleus and the cell begin the vital functions and differentiations of our life.

The life-point and the bioplasm are the same for all organisms. The oak, the lowest animal, and man, the highest, seem identical in the germ and primal substance. We have in this a disproof of atheistic evolution, for, as Dr. Stirling stated, "If all life is identified in protoplasms, so also you must differentiate all life in protoplasms." There is certainly a difference not as yet detected, for we are unable to examine the living substance ; it dies before we can begin. "The life flashes, as it were, into inanimate particles, and they live"; but the difference between one flash and another is that between mind and no mind, between a responsible soul and no soul.

From the first moment of its beginning to be, the embryo is a germinating concrete unity of body and soul. The first man was not as the present embryo child. Body preceded the soul. God makes the body now. He is the impelling cause, not the soul ; and the soul is that for which the body is made ; the process is graduated. We are not best at once, but, as General Lambert said, "The best man is man at the best"; and we add, "The best world is the world at the best." Thitherward we are tending. Not we nor Nature will pass away as the baseless fabric of a vision. Men of science are not foolish dreamers when they tell us that nothing perishes. We do not think that the Almighty plays at making and unmaking ; destroys as fast as He makes. All grades of being, all orders of existence, are attuned, and the wonderful chords of life are being attuned here, for a wonderful harmony somewhere.

Subject next Wednesday—"What is Death?"

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MICROBE OF DEATH.

SIR,—The *Westminster Gazette* recently published a telegram stating that "Dr. Wheeler, of Chicago, claimed to have discovered what he is pleased to term the microbe of death, which can be destroyed even as other microbes perish at the hands of the expert. If it can be destroyed, nothing short of actual violence can put an end to any one's term of existence." It was added that the discovery "had created a great sensation in Chicago." It may be as well to say that this telegram appeared in the issue of April 1st. The *Spectator*, commenting on the news, observed: "The truth is that death, far from being a misfortune to the race, is perhaps, even to the individual, the greatest of all earthly blessings. . . . . If we could, indeed, discover . . . . the true 'microbe of death,' then, instead of invoking the power of the expert to extinguish it, we should regard it as the most inestimable of God's gifts."

I cannot help thinking, however, that it will be a difficult task to persuade mankind to recognise in "the last enemy, death" (1 Cor. xv. 26) the smiling face of a true friend, and to hail "the King of Terrors" as "the greatest of all earthly blessings."

> To die, and go we know not where;
> To lie in cold obstruction, and to rot;
> This sensible warm motion to become
> A kneaded clod.

How can we deem this a blessing? Even with all the modern scientific improvements and all the attractive conveniences, including "a perishable coffin," so winningly pressed on our acceptance by the Funeral Reform Association. To that well-meaning association may be commended Pascal's words: "Let us not think a corpse to be a mere infectious carcase, as the fallacy of Nature represents it; but as the eternal and inviolable temple of the Holy Ghost, which by faith we know it to be."

The poet sounded a truer note than the *Spectator* when he said:

> Whatever crazy sorrow saith,
> No life that breathes with human breath
> Has ever truly longed for death.
> 'Tis life, whereof our nerves are scant,
> Oh, life, not death, for which we pant,
> More life, and fuller, that we want.

There are other conceivable ways of quitting this world besides that of "shuffling off this mortal coil." Even St. Paul, though "groaning" in his "earthly tabernacle," "being burdened," had no desire to be "unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life"; and St. John assures us that our Saviour "came that we might have life, and have it more abundantly" (2 Cor. v. 1, 4; John x. 10). And what need for the distressed individual to apply to the scientific expert for "the microbe of death,"

> When he himself might his quietus make
> With a bare bodkin?

It is not very probable that the scientist will ever discover "the microbe of death." He does not use the right instrument for the purpose. As well might he apply the microscope to examine the stars. Science, in her investigations, ignores the moral aspect of things—suffers, in fact, from moral colour-blindness, and can see no distinction between the good man and the bad man, both alike belonging to the group *Bimana*, the seventeenth order of the *Mammalia*; while, in truth, there is the greatest gulf fixed between the two, and they are in reality as widely separated as the east is from the west.

Again, how can "the microbe of death" be rightly regarded as "the most inestimable of God's gifts"? "As if death could come from the Living Fountain of Life; nothingness and phantom from the plenitude of reality! the absoluteness of Creative Will!" (Coleridge).

In the prospect of death, the stoic Emperor Marcus Aurelius, we are told, "comforted himself by the certainty that 'death is according to Nature, and nothing is evil according to Nature.'" But the stoic had, as Bishop Lightfoot observes, "no real consciousness of sin"; and Pascal declares that this "looking on death as natural to man is the error which has blinded all mankind from the beginning." "Death natural, it must always be remembered," says Archbishop Trench, "is rather death *unnatural*; for man was made for *immortality* (Gen. ii. 17), and death is the denial and reversal of the true law of his creation" (Rom. v. 12; Wisdom i. 13-16). Life, the first attribute of the Living God, is the highest expression of Nature, and love is the highest expression of life. Death is a hideous negation of both—a blank contradiction of Nature, which teems with life and culminates in man—

> Man, her last work, who seemed so fair,
> Such splendid purpose in his eyes;
> Who loved and suffered countless ills,
> Who battled for the True, the Just;
> Who trusted God was Love indeed,
> And Love creation's Final Law.

If death, the strongest force in Nature, remains supreme, and is, indeed, lord of all, then man, unredeemed from the grave, is no better than—

> A monster and a dream,
> A discord. Dragons of the prime,
> That tare each other in their slime,
> Were mellow music matched with him.

Is not the true "microbe of death" nothing else than sin (Rom. v. 12; vi. 23), which throughout all generations has wrought and brought such deadly, woful, ghastly havoc upon the human race; and the true remedy for which has been, is being, and ever more and more will be proclaimed in "the everlasting Gospel"?

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 16th, 1895.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Jesus before the High Priest (Mark xiv. 53-64). Jesus is now brought before the High Priest. No doubt the chief priests and elders and Scribes were glad to have Christ thus brought to judgment. They assembled in good numbers. We are told Peter did not care to come too near, but remained with the servants (verse 54). We notice how the chief men endeavoured to find witness against Jesus in order to condemn Him to death, but could find none. Sad, it is recorded there were many that were ready to bear false witness against Him, and got up statements which were altogether self-contradictory and contained not a particle of conviction against Him. Jesus stood silent. The High Priest, who, no doubt, was impressed with the dignity, manner, and forbearance of Jesus, asked Jesus,

"Answerest Thou nothing? What is it which these witness against Thee?" This statement could not be truthfully sustained. Jesus still kept silent. Then again the High Priest put another question to Jesus: "Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" This was, if asked from a genuine heart, and a judge with righteous integrity, a fair question. At any rate, Jesus took the opportunity now and opened His mouth, and being a fitting question for Him to answer, said in solemn language: "I am the Son of God, the Son of the Blessed, and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (verse 62). This was enough; the High Priest rent his clothes, and said, "What need we further witnesses? (verses 63, 64). What shall we do to Him? I need not dwell any longer or ask Him any further questions. Ye have heard the blasphemy which He has uttered from His own mouth." How eagerly and ready are those who are set against the innocent to cry out as with one voice to condemn and convict! Yes, the assembly of the Jewish officials and others cried that Jesus was guilty of death. Thus Jesus was treated with absolute unfairness and a mock trial before the High Priest. Practical lessons:— 1. Jesus innocently brought before the High Priest. 2. Jesus had no witnesses to prove Him guilty. 3. Jesus endured with fortitude false witnesses. 4. Jesus accused, yet innocent. 5. Jesus is the Son of God. 6. Jesus is our salvation, and will at last judge the world.

Follow to the judgment-hall,
View the Lord of Life arraigned;
Oh, the wormwood and the gall!
Oh, the pangs His soul sustained!
Shun not suffering, shame, or loss,
Learn of Him to bear the Cross.

—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Acton, Rev. E., M.A., Vicar of Hinton St. Mary's, Sturminster Newton; Honorary Secretary for the Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund in the Diocese of Salisbury.

Ashton-Gwatkin, Rev. W. H. T., M.A., Curate of Wye; Vicar of Margate.

Bardsley, Rev. Herbert James, M.A., Curate of Sandal Magna with St. Catherine's; Rector of St. Paul's, Hulme.

Bater, Rev. A. B., B.A., Lecturer at the Training College, Warrington; General License, Diocese of Chester.

Browne, Rev. W. R., Rector of St. Mary's, Hamilton, N.B.; Acting Chaplain to the Forces.

Butler, Rev. Henry Dobree, B.A., Curate of Stratford-on-Avon; Rector of Inkpen, Berks.

Collett, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Hughley; Vicar of Church Preen, Salop (by dispensation).

Copeland, Rev. G. Dale, B.D., Vicar of Pudsey; Surrogate for the Diocese of Wakefield.

De Trévelec, Rev. Harry, B.A., Curate of All Saints', Chorlton-on-Medlock; Chaplain to Henshaw's Blind Asylum and Manchester Schools for the Deaf and Dumb.

Donald, Rev. M. S., M.A.; Vicar of Grinsdale, Carlisle.

Durnford, Rev. E. F. P., M.A., Curate; Vicar of All Souls', Hastings.

Eyre, Rev. J. R., M.A., Vicar of Sheffield; Rural Dean of Sheffield.

Flower, Rev. Willoughby, M.A., Archdeacon and Vicar of Grafton; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Grafton and Armidale.

Fry, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Corbally, Roscrea; Canon of Tulloh, in Kilalloe Cathedral.

Harris, Rev. George, A.K.C., Curate-in-Charge; Rector of Ruckinge, Kent.

Hayman, Rev. Reginald J. E., Vicar of Stawell; Vicar of St. Peter's, Ballarat.

Hobson, Rev. Richard, Vicar of St. Nathaniel's, West Derby, Liverpool; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.

Holland Rev. E. R., M.A., Curate of Clunbury, Aston-on-Clun; Vicar of St. Chad's, Handforth.

Hone, Rev. Evelyn J., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Deptford, and Rural Dean; Rector of Esher.

Hudson, Rev. John Clare, M.A., Rector of Martin-with-Thornton; Prebendary of Asgarby, in Lincoln Cathedral.

Husband, Rev. C. F., Vicar of Cudworth; Vicar of Kirkby Ireleth, Lancashire.

Keene, Rev. Rees, M.A., Curate of St. Bees, and Lecturer of St. Bees Theological College; Rector of Gosforth-with-Seascale, Cumberland.

Kenyon-Stow, Rev. Llewellyn John; Vicar of Steeple Claydon, Bucks.

Knight, Rev. H. J. Corbett, M.A., Tutor and Lecturer of Selwyn College, Cambridge; Rector of Marnhull, Dorset.

Lamb, Rev. Arthur Hutchinson, M.A., Vicar of Hope-under-Dinmore and Ford, Leominster; Vicar of Worlaby, Lincolnshire.

Livesey, Rev. S. J., M.A., Curate of Kendal; Vicar of Skelsmergh, Kendal.

May, Rev. Frederic Schiller, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Paddington; Rector of High Laver, Essex.

Philp, Rev. William, Curate of Hornchurch for Harold Wood; Rector of Shelley, Essex.

Powys, Rev. C. F., M.A., Vicar of Montacute; Honorary Ruridecanal Secretary for the Church Army in the Martock Division of the Deanery of Ilchester, Bath and Wells.

Pulleyn, Rev. John Walker, Vicar of Shepley, Huddersfield; Rector of Chelsworth, Suffolk.

Roberts, Rev. Charles Edmund, M.A.; Rector of Halton, Bucks.

Robinson, Rev. T., Curate of Yardley; Vicar of The Lye, Worcestershire.

St. Aubyn, Rev. Edmund, Vicar of Grazeley, Berkshire; Rector of Babworth, Retford.

Sanders, Rev. Henry Martyn, M.A., Senior Curate of St. Luke's, Liverpool; Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the North-Western District.

Shaw, Rev. Edward Domett, M.A., Curate; Vicar of High Wycombe, Bucks.

Short, Rev. T. Tapley, Curate of Mildurn; Incumbent of St. Paul's, Ballarat East.

Still, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norfolk; Commissary in England of the Bishop of Wellington, New Zealand.

Stretton, Rev. J. G. M., M.A., Assistant Curate of St. Saviour's, Denmark Park, S.E.; Curate-in-Charge of West Row, Mildenhall, Suffolk.

Titherington, Rev. A. F., M.A., Assistant-Master and Tutor of Radley College; Head Master of Brighton College.

Tyrer, Rev. F. B., M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour's, Everton; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.

Vernham, Rev. Frederic William, Curate of St. Saviour's, Walthamstow; Minister of the Chapel-of-Ease of St. James's, in the Parish of St. Saviour s, Walthamstow.

Waghorne, Rev. Arthur C.; Priest-in-Charge of Bay of Islands, Newfoundland.

Warner, Rev. Richard Edward, M.A., Rector of North and South Stoke, Grantham; Prebendary of Bedford Major in Lincoln Cathedral.

Warren, Rev. John Shrapnel, M.A., Rector of Willoughby; Prebendary of Caister in Lincoln Cathedral.

Westacott, Rev. C. F., M.A., Assistant-Curate of St. Bartholomew's, Armley; Vicar of St. Luke's, Leeds.

Wetherall, Rev. A. G. M.; Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.

Whelpton, Rev. H. U., M.A., Vicar of All Souls', Hastings; Senior Curate of St. Saviour's, Eastbourne.

Whitney, Rev. J. P., M.A., Rector of Hempstead-with-Lessingham, Norfolk; Rector of Milton, Cambridge.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Johnston, Rev. Robert, formerly of Beverley and St. Andrew's, N.B., on the 26th ult., aged 92.

Rackham, Rev. Robert Reeve, Rector of Bintry-cum-Themelthorpe, on the 18th ult., aged 71.

Suter, Right Rev. Andrew Burn, D.D., for upwards of twenty-five years Bishop of Nelson, at Nelson, New Zealand, on March 29th, aged 64.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ATONEMENT.

By Canon CHARLES GORE, M.A.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey, Sunday, April 7th, 1895.

"All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His blood, to show His righteousness, because of the pas ing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season: that He might Himself be just, and the justifier of Him that hath faith in Jesus." —Rom. iii. 23-26 (R.V.).

ST. PAUL announces the doctrine of the atonement. What a marvellous contrast there is in the way in which that doctrine has been and is received! To the man who looks at it from outside and as a matter of intellectual theory, presenting it to his mind probably in something which believers would regard as a parody of the truth, it seems to him nothing in the world except a difficulty or even an occasion of ridicule. "How," he says to himself, "can a just God accept the pains of an innocent victim as a reason for letting off the guilty multitude?" And he goes his way, perhaps moving off from the Christian creed disgusted, alienated. Now in your imagination think of another. He is conscious of sin, sick with its burden; he feels the pollution which the outrage has been on humanity, the blasphemy which it has been against God; he cannot rid himself of the burden or of the defilement. His eyes are turned towards the Crucified, over the figure of Him who hangs there; and there is written in his imagination, in letters of light, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to the end that every one who believeth in Him shall have everlasting life." "Yes!" he cries—and the cry comes from his inmost being—"this is the gift of God to me, to a sinner like me; this is the perfect atonement for the sins of the whole world and for my sins—the atonement of the Son of God, made Son of Man. So he comes and he kneels by the crucifix, he confesses his sins there, the polluted by the unpolluted, by the side of his brother Man, Jesus, the Son of Man. He throws himself in simple faith on Jesus Christ to save him, and in the like simplicity of faith he receives from the hand of the Son the pardon of the Father; and he goes away with the cry of exaltation on his lips, "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanses us from all sins, and we thus judge that if one died for all, then all died, and that He died that we which live henceforth should live not unto ourselves, but unto Him that died for us."

Which is right?—the logic of the few, or the experience of the very many; the very many, aye, of the multitude which no man can number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, who sing the great song of triumph to Him that died and redeemed us by His blood. The experience of the many or the logic of the few—which is right?

Do not we say in our common talk that an ounce of experience is worth a pound of logic? And here the weight of the experience is constant, so varied, so manifold, that it is to any one who really believes in human nature at all, impossible to doubt that it must correspond to a great truth, for all over the world in the various religious rites of human nature you find propitiations, and sacrifices, and incantations, and charms, and cries for pardon; but nowhere—nowhere, at least, to at all the same extent—do you find, except in Christianity, and in that part of the Old Testament, which was, as it were, but a foretaste of Christianity, nowhere do you find that same assurance of pardon for the blood of Jesus, nowhere, as a consequence, that same rebound of the enfranchised soul into unselfish holiness.

We will trust, then, the experience; we will be sure there is something in it. And yet we will not give up the logic—at least we will not give up the reason. We shall not be able to fathom Divine mysteries. You cannot fathom any of the elemental mysteries of Nature or religion; but you will expect that the Divine mystery which comes from the God who is perfect reason shall at least present to our reason some intelligible principle which it can get hold of, in which it can feel at home, in which it can feel its own reason as being both sanctioned and blessed by the reason of God.

I do not propose to attempt to meet the difficulties which have been raised against the doctrine of the Atonement, but I propose to do something which, to my mind at least, is more satisfactory. I propose to ask your attention positively to the meaning of that great truth, to ask you if it can be so without presupposition, and without consideration of objections which you have heard, to think whether you cannot say, if not in its great central principle, at least in part, what this doctrine means. Last Sunday we were considering together how the cross reveals the sinfulness of man, the sinfulness of the world which rejected and crucified Jesus of Nazareth. This afternoon let us consider how this most stupendous of all crime is over-ruled by God, who in the sacrifice of Jesus of Nazareth provides the propitiation for the sins of all mankind.

Sin, my brethren, is not only a mistake, not only a misuse of our faculties, not only a wrong to society; it is also an outrage against God, God our Father, who has made us for nothing less than personal fellowship with Himself; and it is because God is a Father, and we are made for the fellowship of sons, it is for no other reason than that that God cannot contemptuously let us off our sins. He cannot forgive us or take us back to Himself without on our part penitence, reparation, expiation, satisfaction. There are fathers here in this congregation—let them bear witness. Supposing a son of yours violates your household by introducing into its purity and its peace drunkenness and vice, would you forgive him in the sense that you would tolerate it, that you would put up with it, that you would overlook it, that you would keep him in the fellowship of the family? No, a thousand times no! In the name of God, in the name of his own interests, lest he should altogether forget the difference between right and wrong, in the name of a family lest it should altogether lose its sanctity, its purity, you must not take him back into the sanctity of the home except he repent, except he make what reparation lies in his power for having so violently, so monstrously outraged the home. So it is with God; it is because we are meant for fellowship with Him in our Father's household that we must be exiled because of our sin—it is for our own sake as well as for His righteousness' sake that God cannot take us back into fellowship with Him except we make reparation for the wrong done; for dream not that the holiness of God is a matter of His arbitrary will, something which He can dispense with if He will. God can no more dispense with the burning holiness which belongs to His Being than the sun can dispense with its own white light of heat. God is in the intelligible essence of His Being a consuming holiness, an everlasting fire. God cannot take us back into fellowship with Himself except there be in us that penitence, that willingness of reparation, that desire of expiation which brings us back, at least in part, into reconciliation with His Being—"Two cannot walk together except they be agreed." So, on a large scale, man became outcast from God. You watch the history of humanity, you watch human nature in its great blocks as it drifts under your eye in the great objects of history, like the clouds in the dim sky, and you see there men and races, generations after generations, left as it were without God, without any secure knowledge of that destiny for which they are made in this world. And the Bible takes this into account. It calls it in St. Paul's language the passing over of sin in the forbearance of God; it is a stage in God's discipline. St. Paul calls it elsewhere the times of ignorance that God winked at as He suffered all nations to walk in their own way, and it is interpreted to us. What does it mean? It means that men are to be left to find out the misery of life apart from God. They are to be left to want God, and, wanting Him, hungering for Him, God, in this world or beyond it, will assuredly satisfy them. But watch the discipline in this world—God waits until men want God. So it was in the time when the Gospel came that Greek-Roman world had come to want God; weary of its own religions, conscious of its own alien condition, it had come to want God. When the Gospel was preached it was a stumbling-block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks, but to those who were being saved it was a salvation and the response of the Gospel, its solid establishment to the church, its strong blossoming, its strong fruitage—all that is evidence that the Gospel of God had succeeded; the times of ignorance that God winked at had passed, and man's necessity became God's opportunity, and God presented Himself with the offer of His own Son.

But let us not forget that God repeats again and again that same discipline. It took a long time before, and it will take a long time on other occasions. We look out on India and Japan, and we get despondent about missionary effort. For years and years India and Japan remained satisfied with their own philosophies and their own religion, but the time has come when they have been brought into contact with Christian civilisation, and they are no longer satisfied. Whatever of intelligence there be casts away the old idolatries, for they are insupportable to any at all enlightened mind; and then they pass into a stage when they seem to desire nothing but just the surface civilisation of Europe, and we get impatient and say, "They do not accept the Gospel." Ah! do not get impatient; the mill of God grinds slowly, but it grinds sure. The times of ignorance God has winked at, He is leading them; they will work out their probation, and the time will come when there, too, that same hunger of God will awaken. And then our responsibility is to see to it that the Gospel of God has been so preached, and the example has been so set before them, and the good works of our Christian faith so manifested that they may glorify God in the day of their visitation. And mark it, too, this method of God in the case of individuals. This or that brother of yours has drifted from Christianity into unbelief, into alienation; you are distressed, you are continually plying him or her with arguments, but the person does not want them. Do not be impatient; let God's discipline have its way. There is before that person the discipline of suffering and the discipline of joy—the discipline of married life, with its ecstasies and its trials—all this is before them; do not be impatient. God works by His own way, and through the experience of this discipline this person and that is brought to feel that after all life will not work without God—"To Thyself, O God, hast Thou made us, and unquiet is the heart of man

until it rest in Thee." And when that desire is kindled in the will and heart of man, then depend upon it the arguments will have to have a very different appearance to what they had when the want was not felt. Do not be impatient, then; that is God's way. There are the times of ignorance that God winks at, but then man's necessity becomes God's opportunity. And it was so in the first preaching of the Gospel. The time was come, and God manifested Himself, as St. Paul says, now, on this present occasion—God manifested Himself in Love. Men had dreamed all kinds of dreams about God, and had all sorts of false imaginations about Him; now He was manifested in the intelligible lineaments of the human character of Jesus of Nazareth. He was manifested as love. "Come unto Me"—it was the voice of God incarnate—"Come unto Me all ye that are weary and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Whosoever will come unto Me, I will in nowise cast him out." It is the voice of pure and simple love, the pure and simple welcome of the love of God to mankind.

But will it do alone and by itself? Will it not quite certainly be misunderstood? Has there not been in all this great period the times of ignorance that God winked at? Has it not been a blurring of the conscience, a blurring of God, of the sense, of the holiness of God? If God gives it only with this offer of His love, will not man be found to have forgotten how holy God is? Will there be any lifting of the standard! Will there be any real revelation of God? Assuredly not. God—St. Paul says it—must vindicate His righteousness, He must show it forth, He must make it manifest; there must be some combination while the love of God is manifested, even at the same moment. His righteousness, His tremendous righteousness, must be guaranteed too. Brethren, do not we feel in our age, in our time do not we feel it, that constant need to re-assert and re-emphasize the Divine holiness? We, in our day, have become very considerate, we think the best we can of everyone; but we are in the corresponding danger of forgetting that strength which there was in the old Puritanism, that real sense of Divine holiness, and of the inexorable sternness which therein lies, "Oh, ye that love the Lord, see that ye hate the thing that is evil."

Much more then when Christ was manifested, much more was it necessary that while the love was shown forth, God should make manifest also His tremendous righteousness. And how? In the same person be it shown forth, Jesus Christ shall manifest not only the love of God, but shall vindicate also that He is true man; He shall vindicate also God's unblenching claim on human nature. And does not He do so? Behold the Son of Man! What see you there? You see the revelation of Divine love. And what more? You see the perfect example of human nature in all the relations of love of one man to another. But you see something more! Jesus Christ, the second Adam, the pattern man, He is before your eyes also acknowledging the claim of God, giving back in man's name to God all that homage, all that allegiance, and all that human wilfulness and weakness and sin and forgetfulness had in generation after generation been robbing God of—all that allegiance, all that homage, behold the Son of Man how He gives it back!

Well, contemplate then this aspect of our Lord's human life, look at Him in His relation to God. What is He? What is that sort of self-oblation, that offering, which the Son of Man makes of His human life before the face of His Father?—consider it. You look all over the world by contrast, and you see everywhere what St. Paul calls man's ignoring of God, and, as a consequence, his ignorance. Refusing to have God in his knowledge, God's claim is troublesome and man repudiated it, and as a result of this widespread refusal to have God in their knowledge there is the ignorance which is penal, which comes as a result of this wilfulness; all kinds of crude conceptions from the blindness of philosophers down to the crude ignorance of idolaters; all kinds of misconceptions and denials in regard to the Being of God—everywhere this ignoring and, as a consequence, this ignorance.

In contrast to that, behold the Son of Man; from first to last that perfect allegiance, "Wist ye not that I must be in My Father's house, or about My Father's business"; that perfect allegiance through all times of prosperity into the times of darkness, "The cup which My Father has given me, shall I not drink it?" that allegiance in the deepest agony and the profoundest gloom when it is no longer "My Father," but "My God"—"My God, why hast Thou forsaken me"; and still through the deepest and profoundest gloom of perplexity the way is made by that steadfast and enduring allegiance, the allegiance of a full, unclouded, unshuddering recognition when it passes again to "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit"; and as an accompaniment of that continual recognition, that perfect knowledge, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." Contemplate that! The Son in His relation to the Father offering continually the homage of a perfect, unfaltering recognition.

And, once again. Human nature is stained with impurity. It was in St. Paul's days simply awful. There was that state of society which St. Paul out of his full knowledge describes, though he will not speak much of it, for it is not lawful even to speak, he says, without as it were a passing shudder of those things which are done of them in secret. Over against all this awful pollution Jesus Christ lifts that homage of a human nature stainlessly, unfaltering, pure.

And, once more, obedience. Everywhere men have been offering either no obedience at all, either that wilfulness which lies at the heart of all sin, or, at the best, the homage of a very partial and faltering obedience. Then behold Him; the allegiance in the intellect is the full obedience in the will, so that in very truth every stage of the human life of our Lord is but one new sphere in which He learns in His human nature something more of the mysteries contained by that word obedience; "He learned obedience from the things which He suffered." Even from that first day in the Temptation when, as was so well described to you this morning, He made that great resolution in the temptation in the wilderness that He would use God's powers only for God's purposes, that He would use God's powers only in God's way, that He would use God's powers only with the patience of God – from that day down to the end, that unfaltering allegiance leading on, as cause to effect, to the rejection, the death, and obedience unto death, even the death of the cross.

And once more. Everywhere there had been a skrinking from pain, everywhere men had shrunk, not only from the consequences of other people's sins, but from the consequences of their own. Jesus, stainless, comes into the world of sin, "He hid not Himself from His own flesh," He let the awful burden which other people's sins, the sins of all mankind, laid upon Him; He let that awful burden come upon His weary shoulders, and He shrunk not from it; He bore men's sicknesses, He carried their infirmities. It was made the more awful to the Son of Man. He, the very Lord of Life, saw so clearly what life ought to be that, to Him, the very contact and nearness of sin was, indeed, unspeakably terrible—

> And Thou hast shuddered at each act,
> And sh ank with an astonished fear,
> As if Thou could'st not bear to see
> The sin ulness of sin so near.

So He shuddered, but shuddered unfaltering. So He is made sin for us, and the burden of the world's long-drawn out sin, pressed down upon His innocent heart, was taken there and suffered to rest, and He bore it unfalteringly unto the end —"made sin for us." Contemplate that great spectacle! The lines along which your imagination must run are the lines of a real human experience; they are the lines along which all our lives must walk. There is nothing here exceptional, nothing here abnormal—I mean in its principle; it has its beginning in what is commen to all of us, and for that very reason we are able to understand something at least of its meaning and its measure. We are approaching Holy Week. Please God, you will not let the distraction of a holiday time draw you away from the real consideration of the moral qualities of Christ's sacrifice, as the days of the tremendous drama are drawn out again under your imagination this Holy Week, as you pass down into the dark valley of the shadow of death and up again to the mounts of glory. Contemplate the moral qualities of Christ's propitiation! Enter into it!

And, remember always: The suffering which came on Christ was not, as far as Holy Scripture can tell us, any special suffering invented, so to speak, by the Father, and laid upon the Son over and above what came upon Him in the course of His unfaltering obedience. He did not in any considerable degree seek suffering for Himself. The Father did not invent any special torment and send it down upon Him other than that which came upon Him in offering the sacrifice of His flawless obedience.

And the blood-shedding of Jesus: Do not suppose that the blood-shedding of Jesus has in it a value for the Father other than the value which it has because it represents that obedience unto death. The blood is the life thereof. The surrender of Jesus, the value of His sacrifice, lies simply in this, in the homage of the flawless and unconditional moral obedience. It is that surrender of the power of God in true and lowly homage, and the shedding of the blood is but the symbol of that obedience, pressed to its furthest point; that obedience which never faltered when death was the penalty. Behold, then, the glory of that perfect Sacrifice. Over and above all the ignorings of God, all the ignorances of it, all the doubts, all the murmurings, behold that perfect obedience; over and against all the disobediences, behold that perfect, that unconditional obedience; over against all the pollution which now as then stained our world with horror, behold that sinless, perfect purity; over and against all the refusals of pain, behold that unfaltering bearing of the burden of sin which was not His own. Contemplate then the moral glory of that sacrifice, and behold Him, the new man, the Head of your new humanity! Look at His attitude towards God by contrast to the attitude which you still see in the world about you, and then know what is acceptable to the Father. That offering, the offering of Jesus, was in the Father's eyes full, perfect, sufficient, satisfactory. It is this offering of the Son in whom the Father is well pleased. He gazed down upon that human nature; He beheld it there in all its rich glory of faculties, of power, of intellect, of imagination, of thought, of knowledge, of love. He beholds it all going up to Him in one great act of homage—one great act which makes itself an expiation for all the withdrawals of allegiance, all the pollutions, all the disobediences, all the ignorings of men, "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased."

And this offering is for us—it is first for us, it is vicarious, it was made in our place, in our stead, without our help. He trod the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with Him. Without our help He has taken it to the

right hand of God; it is glorified at the right hand; it lives for ever, it is full, perfect, and sufficient; there is nothing which can be added to it, there is no flaw in it that requires being made up; it was all done outside us and for us—that pure gift of the love of God.

We speak of that as our vicarious sacrifice; but if He is vicarious, He is representative. There is the whole question; what is a representative? It is one who stands for others, and you cannot stand for others except the others be behind you, except your action carries their action with it. Christ can only be our representative if we are identified with His sacrifice, and there is the truth. Christ can be for us first of all, only because first for us He is then in us; only because we, one by one in the long sequence of the acts of faith, come to be identified with that homage, full, perfect, and sufficient, made for us.

Consider identity by faith. Every one of faith in Jesus. We need nothing but faith. What is faith?—to believe in Christ; it is to desire something; it is to want something; it is to be dissatisfied with ourselves as we are; it is to lay our hands on Christ—and say, "There in that spotless Manhood I see what I want, what I would be, what I would identify myself with." A faith which has not that moral meaning in it is what St. Paul calls the faith which is without love, and which, though it could remove mountains, is nothing Faith must morally identify us who feel the faith with Him in whom we believe. Faith lays its hands on Jesus, and confessing its own utter misery, simply says, "I desire Him, I want Him, I believe in Him"; and that first movement of faith, by which the outcast soul from the far-off country of his banishment claims Christ and chooses Him, that act of faith is by God accepted, so it is taken for the moment as much more than it already is, and God accepts us in the first movement of faith, and in the name of Jesus Christ His Son forgives us our sins, lets us rid of its burden, lets us start without them. And how? you say. We are still in our sins; how can we be reckoned as pure when we are not pure? Ah! brethren, that is a great question, but there is, I think, a somewhat easy answer. At the last the sins of Saul, the Pharisee, are only forgiven by Paul the Apostle, because they no longer belong to his changed character; at the last our sins will only be forgiven us because they no longer belong to our transformed character. But God deals with us not as we are, nor as we are not, but what we are becoming. Every true estimate of any one is the estimate of them not as they are, but as they are becoming. Therefore, as soon as God sees in the heart of the sinner a desire to return, as soon as He sees him lay his hand on Christ and claim Him in faith for His own, God in His love lets go the past, God in His love looks forward to the future, God in His love absolves and calls the sinner, and lets him start on his new path. It is provisional, quite true. Let not a man work out the meaning of his faith, let him not pursue it to the moral consequences. All the old debt of his sins comes back upon him as in the parable, the debt that was remitted to the ungrateful servant rolled back upon him when he acted uncharitably towards his brother man. But, surely, that is the method by which God deals with us. Again and again as soon as ever we begin, as soon as ever we make the first start, or, after ever so many lapses, come back again and confess our sins, and again lay hold of Christ and in faith in Him ask for forgiveness; again and again we are in Christ's name accepted; again and again we are set free from the burdens, cleansed from stains, set free to walk again. As the man who begins to move feels the burden round his neck, again and again that burden is taken off, and again and again we are accepted in Christ.

And that faith is only the beginning. Faith leads to incorporation. We are baptised in the Christ, we share His life, we possess His Spirit. Ah! yes, Christ for us! That first, only because Christ in us. That next, Christ in us. We are taken into His life, we share His Spirit, the laws of His life begin to become the laws of ours. At a great distance, what He is we strive to be, and His power is with us, lifting us out of ourselves. Christ for us, only because Christ in us.

Christ in us. If so, then we, too, must share His life—not only His relation to other men, but His relation to God. We are taken up into His sacrifice, too; that, too, we must share. We say in the hymn:

> Thine the sharp thorns,
> And mine the golden crown;

but is there anything in Holy Scripture which would justify the phrase? I do not say it is not a truth; but is not the whole Scripture full of the other thought? "Thine the sharp thorns," aye, and mine, too. If we suffer with Him we shall be glorified together, taken up into His life. We do not seek suffering, but we seek obedience; and obedience for us, as for Him, means suffering; it brings pain. We share His sacrifice, we are taken up, we too each in our way come to know something of that same allegiance, of that same obedience, of that same bearing of the consequence of our sins. Aye, but He was sinless. Nothing that happened to the Son of Man but happened to Him through bearing the normal lot of man, and we sharing His life shall share in our measure the fortunes which befel Him. Christ for us; that first, and then Christ in us. And surely all the distortion, all the misunderstandings which have engirdled this doctrine of the Atonement have been because men have forgotten that Christ in us must for ever follow close upon Christ for us.

And behold how in the two great sacraments, with an impressiveness which nothing can surpass, there that great principle is held before our eyes. We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins—a baptism in which we are forgiven; and why? Because we are incorporated, we are forgiven our sins, because we enter upon His life, and the forgiveness of our sins is made possible for us just by this very thing, that the power of the new life enters into us which is to lift us at last out of the power of sin.

But look again. We approach the altar. What to do? To plead that great and perfect sacrifice, to lift it there above our heads, in between our faults, our failures, our weaknesses, our imperfections, to cover all the feebleness of our own deficiencies with the glory of that perfect homage, the glory of that perfect sacrifice. But how—how is it we can plead His sacrifice?

Again, because we share His life. It is by feeding on His life that we become partakers in His sacrifice; and feeding on His life we become partakers not in pleading only, but in realising it. We say, "And here we offer and present unto Thee ourselves, O Lord, our body, souls, and spirits, to be a reasonable holy sacrifice unto Thee." Accepted, surely, accepted we, too, in the beloved.

Brethren, may we not take this elementary moral principle into our very being? What we want is not to be let off the consequences of our sins. Acceptance is only a first step to goodness; pardon is only an entrance into the kingship and the priesthood. If you do not go on from being forgiven to becoming holy, then the very being forgiven falls away from you. Christ is not merely our vicarious sacrifice, He is the representative man, and our fellowship with Him means, and must mean, that in will and in intention we identify ourselves with Him. And if this be so, if we take it and dwell upon it, and let it take shape and form in our minds, then does not all the glory, all the necessity of that great act of atonement become real and vivid to us. Was it not necessary that over against all men's forgetfulness of God and refusal of Him, and disobediences and pollution, there should be seen in the person of the Son of Man that perfect homage of that perfect sacrifice offered in man's name before the face of the Father. Aye, it was offered, it was offered in the patient glory of that life; it was offered in the agony of dying on the cross; it was offered and consecrated and taken to the unseen world, and lives for evermore in that state in which He lived, beyond what we can imagine or conceive. But still very man before the Father. He lives there, but He lives not in that alone. We are His members, we are knit on to Him; His Spirit links our inmost being to Jesus, where He ever presents Himself before the right hand of the Father. In all our deficiencies, in all our intermittent efforts, in all our countless failures, in all our imperfect struggles, with all our pollution, still we are knit on to Him. If we do not give Him up, if we do not by any utter abandonment give up the struggle and reject His name, still we are in Him and He in us; and still that presentation whereby He offers Himself before the face of the Father carries us with Him. We in Him are offered there, and He is ever drawing us, by every movement of His Spirit, by every good inspiration, by every desire after holiness, is drawing us, from all generations, and classes and kinds and tongues, drawing us there to that one meeting-point where the whole human race is one before the face of God. And we know it, we are sure if we will lay hold on it. If again and again, after every collapse, we will come back and plead His sacrifice and confess our sins and take His forgiveness and begin again, then, as the result of all our struggles, through the pain of death, through the perfecting and purging, at last that which shall be presented shall be Christ in us and us in Christ—not Christ alone before the face of the Father, but Christ in the Head and in the members of the Bridegroom and the Bride—from all nations and kindred and peoples and tongues accepted in the Beloved!

MESSRS. LONGMANS have in the press a new book by the author of "Jesus, the Carpenter of Nazareth," entitled "Joseph, the Dreamer," in which he gives, in a series of interesting pictures, the story of the life of Joseph, set in its natural surroundings, from the black tents of the shepherds of Mesopotamia to the gilded palace of the King of Egypt.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—The despised Saviour. "He is despised and rejected of men" (Isaiah liii. 3). Introduction.—The prophet here is pathetically pourtraying the sufferings of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In all the declarations of the prophets in the long centuries previous to Christ's coming, all were fulfilled with wonderful accuracy—His coming, birthplace, sufferings, and culminated in His death. We know how He was shamefully treated by men, and how He was shamefully brought to judgment, and the mock trials He had to endure. He bore all this with wonderful endurance for our sake, for in everything He endured ignominy, scorn, and shame that He may make our salvation perfect. He indeed demonstrated before His very enemies that He was the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. He was, nevertheless, despised and rejected of men. But thus it behoved Christ to endure all things that were spoken by the prophets. We learn a few lessons from this subject:—1. What the prophets declare was true with reference to Christ. 2. Christ's coming into the world of infinite importance. 3. Christ's suffering for our sake. 4. Christ shamefully despised and rejected by men. 5 Christ's suffering and death for man's salvation.

He comes, the prisoners to release,
In Satan's bondage held;
The gates of brass before Him burst,
The iron fetters yield.

"He is despised and rejected of men."—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 8, 1895.

COUNSELS OF DESPAIR.

THE anxious and unhappy position of the supporters of the Government is curiously indicated by the present attitude of the Radical Press towards Local Veto. There is a scarcely-veiled demand that this item shall be dropped from the Government programme, accompanied by a dismal foreboding that defeat in Parliament and at polls will follow if it is not.

The morality of this proceeding is interesting and peculiar. The righteousness of the cause is taken for granted, and is insisted upon more warmly than ever. Nevertheless, it is to be abandoned on grounds of expediency. In other words, the evils of intemperance are to go on unchecked in order that a Radical Government may continue in office. Of course we all know that this is the principle of the Government, but such a candid avowal was certainly not expected, and it is not likely to redound to the credit or advantage of those who make it. A rigid adherence to principle is not always possible in politics, sacrifices to expediency have occasionally to be made. But this is going too far. Local Veto has been by this Government elevated to the rank of an article of faith. The unlooked for introduction of the present Bill into an already heavily overloaded Session was accounted for under the plea of almost religious necessity. And now it is degraded to the level of an auction parade. The hobby-horse has been trotted out; there is no prospect of any very brisk bidding, so it is to go back again. This sort of thing, carried only a little further, would undermine all the principles of party government, for a Ministry would never persevere in any measure which appeared unlikely to command a certain majority. Bills would always be withdrawn, rather than rejected, and a direct vote of censure would be the only means of deciding questions of confidence.

The extraordinary suggestions of the Radical Press are probably, however, not so much the fruit of sage deliberation as counsels of despair. The evidence of loss of public confidence can no longer be disregarded. It is obvious, even to the stoutest partizans, that the present flow of popular feeling is dead against the Government, and the question is as to its volume only, not its direction. This rude awakening has caused a good deal of soreness, and poor Local Veto is getting the benefit of it all. But really Local Veto has got no more to do with it than any other item of the disastrous Newcastle Programme. Ever since they came into office the Ministry have been essaying hopeless and futile tasks, "ploughing the sands" indeed. They never had the mandate they pretended, they never had won the confidence they claimed. Coming into office by a chapter of accidents they persuaded themselves of the truth of their pretensions, and, thanks to the wonderful genius of Mr. Gladstone, contrived to give a specious show of reality for a time to their elaborate legislative burlesque. It was the secret of Mr. Gladstone's remarkable influence that he could always succeed in thoroughly deceiving himself, and then his transparent earnestness went a long way towards deceiving others. But when he left public life, he did not leave his mantle behind him, and his successors have not even deceived themselves, to say nothing of the country. Smarting under failure and disappointment they fasten, like children, on something to vent their temper on, and the only safe thing is Local Veto.

There are, indeed, indications of a still more unruly spirit of revenge and resentment. For instance, the *Daily Chronicle* waxes very bold, and calls aloud for the removal, not only of Local Veto, but of both Sir William Harcourt and Lord Rosebery. Sir William's fault appears to be that he is responsible for too much, Lord Rosebery's too little. This is in the truest spirit of Oriental despotism—to dismiss in disgrace the unsuccessful or unlucky favourites, and bring in others. Mr. Morley and Mr. Asquith seem to be the new heroes until their turn comes for the cold shoulder, and after them, no doubt, the deluge, or the Independent Labour Party.

The truth is, the Radicals are thoroughly demoralised, they find themselves on the verge of a crisis, with a few discredited shreds of policy, and without men who might make up for the want of measures. The rank and file have no confidence in leaders who are at variance with one another and do not know their own minds. Lord Rosebery's premiership has turned out a dire fiasco, but they can neither do with him nor without him. He is the only man they have with any

marked hold on the public; but he is not the leader of their counsels, and is not popularly uspposed even to acquiesce in them. The leader of the House of Commons, Sir William Harcourt, able as he is, fills no great place in the public mind, He is not the man to win a General Election, but he is not going to stand by for any one else. The party, such as it is, is deeply committed to a policy of inconsistencies, which has, confessedly, excited no enthusiasm, nor even interest. Under such depressing circumstances it is not surprising that men should feel and talk a little wild.

On the other hand the Opposition seems united, if not homogeneous. The recent elections have effectually disposed of any anticipations of a Unionist split. There is every sign that the Unionists will go to the country full of spirit and confidence in their leaders, of whom at least this much will on all hands be acknowledged, that th y have disappointed no hopes, and that they have conducted their Parliamentary campaign with great ability and singular success. And there is this in their favour, apart from all questions of policy, that now the great figure of Mr. Gladstone is removed, there is absolutely no one on the Radical side to compare personally with Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chambertain, Lord Salisbury, and the Duke of Devonshire, to say nothing of others. There can be no doubt of the success of the party with men and measures against the party with neither. Probably the Radicals, who in no case can hope to do well in the coming struggle, would do less ill by behaving handsomely to Local Veto, instead of giving it the cold shoulder in the unscrupulous way suggested in some quarters. Sticking to it now cannot seriously affect their fate; and they might at least win respect by doing so. For the credit of English politics we hope they will take the risk, and refuse to hear the voice of the charmers of the *Daily Chronicle* and the *Westminster Gazette*, who indeed do not charm either wisely or honourably.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE *English Churchman*, which represents the remnant of extreme Protestants who object even to pray for Re-union, has disinterred, as suitable for the occasion, the prayer appended to the homily for Whitsun Day in the Book of Homilies. It is to this effect :—"The Lord of Heaven and earth defend us from their (the Papists') tyranny and pride, that they never enter into His vineyard again, to the disturbance of His silly poor flock; but that they may be utterly confounded and put to flight in all parts of the world; and He of His great mercy so work in all men's hearts, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable Gospel of His Son Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places, to the beating down of sin, death, the Pope, the Devil, and all the Kingdom of Antichrist."

Archdeacon Sinclair has publicly inducted the Rev. H. R. Gamble to the living of St. Botolph, Aldersgate Street. We are glad to learn that, despite the opposition in the parish to his appointment, the new Vicar was courteously received by the churchwardens, as indeed was to be expected, and it is to be hoped that, as there is no personal objection to the appointment, Mr. Gamble will be loyally supported. In the course of his address, the Archdeacon said that the work done by the late curate, the Rev. T. Selby Henrey (for whom the parishioners wanted to secure the living), was of such value that he hoped a suitable sphere for his energies would soon be found.

The Rev. E F. Durnford, son of the Bishop of Chichester, has accepted the vicarage of All Souls', Hastings, rendered vacant by the resignation of the Rev. H. U. Whelpton, who be omes senior curate, under his father, at St. Saviour's, Eastbourne.

The Rev. W. Lancelot Holland, who has just seceded from the Church of England, and thereby vacated the English Episcopal Church of St. Thomas at Edinburgh, is to be succeeded by the Rev. J. Lindsay Young, of St. John's, Portsea. Mr. Young has made himself conspicuous at Portsmouth by his fraternisation with Dissenters, and has incurred the rebuke of his Bishop for disobedience He will doubtless find himself at home as minister of a congregation which acknowledges no episcopal authority.

Sir Richard Webster, Q.C., and Mr. W. D. Thurnam have given an opinion upon the question of licenses for the marriage of divorced persons. They are of opinion that the granting of licenses is a discretionary act on the part of the Ordinary, and that neither the Bishop nor his duly delegated officer can be compelled to grant a license in any case in which he in his discretion thinks it right not to do so. They are further of opinion that it is lawful for any person present in the church, acting in good faith at the time of the ceremony, to allege a just cause or impediment either by God's law or by the law of the realm, and that so doing would not render such a person subject to penalties for brawling.

One of the arguments in favour of Welsh Disestablishment is that if it is found impossible to maintain the ministrations of the Church in poor parishes, the Nonconformists have made such ample provision that there is no fear of the people relapsing into heathenism. In opposition to this allegation, the *South Wales Star* prints a list of more than sixty places in Monmouthshire where there is no Dissenting chapel. Nearly all these villages bear names which are unmistakeably Welsh.

Dean Farrar has arranged for a course of lectures at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on the Wednesday evenings during June, on the "Doctrines of the Prayer Book." The course will be as follows :—June 5th, "The Prayer Book and Absolution," the Rev. Prebendary Eardley-Wilmot; June 12th, "Infant Baptism," the Rev. A. E. Barnes-Lawrence; June 19th, "Holy Communion," the Rev. Canon Girdlestone; and June 26th, "The Church and the Bible," the Rev. W. Abbott. All the lecturers, it need hardly be said, are Evangelicals, though not of an extreme sort.

The clergy of the Doncaster deanery have, on the motion of Canon Tebbutt, the vicar of the mother parish, adopted a resolution by twenty-one to five,

recording their deep regret at the introduction of extreme Ritual in two of the churches of the deanery, and of teaching correspondent to such Ritual. The resolution continues, "We declare that as a body we neither sympathise with the Ritual in question nor acquiesce in such teaching in so far as it goes beyond the teaching of the Prayer Book as interpreted by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his judgment on the Bishop of Lincoln's case."

The *Record* says that this resolution was seconded by a High Church incumbent, and supported by men of widely differing views. It expresses, we venture to say, the feeling of a very large majority, both of clergy and laity. That the Archbishop's judgment fixed the maximum of permissible ritual ought to be firmly maintained by loyal Churchmen, at least until it shall be over-ruled (if that should ever come to pass).

Canon Hammond, of St. Austell, who is a convert from Nonconformity, and has written several books against it, has evidently no prejudice against Nonconformists as individuals. He has been entertaining at his house the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes during that gentleman's recent visit to Cornwall on business connected with the Wesleyan body.

When the people clearly understand that the Church is neither State-made nor State-paid, and that chapel endowments and church endowments are held on precisely the same tenure, and represent the gifts of private individuals and not of Governments, many now hostile to the Church (because they believe the contrary of all this) will become its most ardent defenders. In the parish school of Tenbury, and in several other schools in the Archdeaconry of Ludlow, in the diocese of Hereford, the older scholars (and through them many parents) are daily being carefully taught the history of the Church, its property, and its true position, by means of Mr. Nye's "Popular History," and the results of the examination of the children have astonished the examiners.

Bishop Beckles has just been appointed Chaplain of the Hastings Workhouse. The *English Churchman* asks, "Has any one heard of a bishop appointed to such an office before in this country?" We rather fancy not. But Dr. Beckles, who has been in orders more than fifty years, has had a chequered career. He was consecrated Bishop of Sierra Leone in 1860. On his return to England he was for some time vicar of St. Peter's, Bethnal Green, and for a considerable time he exercised an irregular episcopal supervision over certain congregations in Scotland which refuse obedience to the Scottish Episcopal Church.

WHAT IS DEATH?

THE Rev. Prebendary Reynolds, in his weekly scientific lecture on Wednesday, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., stated:—

The difference between life and death is a sharp distinction: but the difference between the life-point and that by which the life-point is nourished is fathomless. Our muscles and nerves are not to be regarded as dead, though they do not generate living particles. These living particles are nourished by bioplasm; upon this bioplasm our growth, our life and all its actions depend; but no organism is wholly alive in any part, indeed it is greatly dead while it lives.

No one sufficiently thinks how greatly whatever lives prepares for a future stage. Worms plow the earth like husbandmen; they tunnel it like engineers; they prepare fine soil like gardeners, and grind the hillside rock till it becomes soft and rich. Their work reappears in many good effects.

Man is an epitome of the past; all former organic life is found again in him, and in more completeness, not as evolved from that, but the crown of it. Further, he is an epitome of the macrocosm as true science conceives it will be. He is built upon a plan which, begun in other organisms, is in him developed, with differences. When you take his blood, his flesh, his bone, his skin, his brain, there is a difference all along. You cannot find any plant, any beast, of which he is child; yet, as every one of them was taken from the earth, so was he—with a difference. We know that, as all meaner processes and things prepared for the higher, so those higher for others yet nobler. Man shines like a star among his lower brethren, transcends them all in thought, emotion, responsibility; and, as sentient, prospective, and prophetic of the future, is a light and shadow of it in hope and fear. Not with light uncertain and dim, but with the same clear flame so entering all knowledge that every art aims at further attainment and aims aright.

We cannot, being reasonable creatures, forget that art, science the whole structure of nature, is in continuity, as it were, by a law; so that our greater faculties in all their grand operations take for granted, and rightly, a future life. In our bodies alive, but the greater part already dead, we stand between the dead and the living. That is not all; some living germs make us die. These living destroyers carry not only physical and mental, but moral evil also, bearing what we ought not to be, not less than what we ought to be, into the living world; yes, even into that not now alive. Herein is a study: we live in the dead parts of the body and use them, though, thus living, it is a deathly life. Now, if our dead selves are bearers of the present life to the inevitable tomb, may we not say, "Our living selves carry a light which so illumines the grave that we see even now a rising from it"?

Death, then, is not wholly unknown; the land is partially surveyed. In ourselves we distinguish the living from the not living, and make the dead subserve the living. We die daily, and we live again daily in our body's various parts. If we did not so die and live, we should have no body. Is it any wonder that as by so dying we make our body, we further possess within the inner man a power that renews the body? If, by being dead now, we live, have we not a programme of the present prevalent continuance, extending and beautifying in the future sphere? Rightly thought of, our future life is not so great a wonder as if we did not live again. Death to him who believes is the path of Life.

THE London Diocesan Church Reading Union has arranged a course of lectures, intended especially for young men, to be delivered at the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C. (near the General Post Office), at 1.15 p.m. on Wednesdays during June. The subjects are as follows:—June 12. "Miracles," Prebendary Shelford. June 19. "The Resurrection," Rev. J. Macarthur. June 26. "The Atonement," Canon Girdlestone.

Reviews and Notices.

"LEX MOSAICA." Edited by the Rev. Richard Valpy French, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S,A. With an Introduction by the late Bishop of Bath and Wells. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

THERE is one question to which we should most earnestly like to have an answer, and that is, What are the laity thinking with regard to the Higher Criticism controversy? Unfortunately, those from amongst the laity whose answer would be most serviceable are usually silent on these matters. They think, but they will not speak. If only they would speak, many of those who are terribly anxious as to the consequences of this controversy would know better what to do.

All the writers in the volume before us feel the gravity of the situation, and the expressed opinions of men like Dr. Wace, Dr. Stanley Leathes, Dr. Sinker, Canon Rawlinson, and others, cannot be, and ought not to be, lightly and contemptuously passed by. Mr. Lias' appeal to the Higher Critics deserves quotation: "There are many," he says, "who cannot accept [these] conclusions, who are perfectly willing to allow the documents to be subjected to the most searching criticism possible. If their statements fail to satisfy the test appliod to them; if the Old Testament narrative, as we now have it, can be ascertained to have been refashioned in the light of the convictions of later ages; if we are compelled, in the face of invincible facts, to invert the order in which that narrative presents them to have occurred, many of us are ready frankly to accept the position. But we are at least entitled to ask that such conclusions should have been carefully tested before they are admitted. This would be necessary in any case; it is ten thousand times more necessary in the case with which we are dealing. We have no right to forget the gravity of the question which confronts us. In a matter such as Homeric criticism, or the history of Greece or Rome, the publication or the acceptance of rash and unsound theories does no harm to anybody It does not matter to us whether Theseus, Homer, Romulus, or Servius Tullius ever existed or not. It does not matter whether the story of Brutus and Lucretia. of the Horatii and Curatii is fact or fiction. But the story of the Old Testament is indissolubly bound up with the most important set of events that can affect mankind. It professes to give us an account of the manner in which God was pleased to reveal His ineffable perfections to His creatures. It is obvious that the premature publication, as the unquestioned and unquestionable discoveries of modern scientific criticism, of theories which may turn out in the end to have been crude and ill-founded, may give an utterly needless shock to faith, and produce evil results which it may take ages to repair. By all means let critical inquiry proceed. By all means let the questions it raises be fully and freely discussed. But let inquirers at least state their conclusions with caution and deference. Let them be careful not to prejudge the grave question before them, and, above all, let them not only be ready, but anxious, to submit their conclusions to the most searching investigations before they venture to represent them as established" (pp. 208, 209).

With these words we express our most thorough, most hearty, and most unqualified agreement. The *tone* of much that has been written on the side of Higher Criticism deserves the severest possible condemnation, not because of the opinions expressed, but because of the utter regardlessness of consequences which has been displayed. Never has the command, "Not so, lest in gathering out the tares ye root out the wheat also," been more openly disregarded; never has less care been displayed to make construction go hand-in-hand with destruction than by some of those to whom Mr. Lias refers. They have not thought that the half-educated read as well as the educated, nor have they considered that while they *have* put a weapon into the hands of the infidel of which he will skilfully avail himself, they have *not* given the half-educated any help against that weapon. Let the ultimate results be what they may, in the immediate future the rashness and want of caution of these writers must produce disastrous results. Mr. Lias has understated, rather than overstated, the gravity of the situation.

It is well that a concerted effort should have been made to answer the new views put forth with so much confidence and so little caution, and we hoped to have in "Lex Mosaica," with its list of writers, many known as competent scholars, a thoroughly careful examination of the problem as a whole. We regret to say that we have not got this. In fact, in our opinion, "Lex Mosaica" will not answer the purpose it was intended to serve; it will not, that is, convince those who feel that there are arguments on both sides and difficulties on both sides. The problem, as a whole, has not been faced; the linguistic argument is hardly touched; there has been no sufficient concert between the writers; there is far too much that is purely personal; and much is advanced which we cannot accept as argument at all. In a word, "Lex Mosaica" will not produce any change of opinion, and we will give our reasons more in detail.

First, the writers do not make it clear what they are defending, or even what they are attacking. In the preface we read: "Sporadic efforts have been already made by responsible writers to show that the new position is either untenable or is fraught with greater difficulties than the traditional view." The "new position," as taught by whom? What is the "traditional view"? Everything, in a controversy like this, depends on a careful delineation both of the positions to be defended and of those to be attacked, and this is exactly what has not been done. Had it been done, the benefit on both sides of the controversy would have been enormous; it might have been both a common ground of defence for the moderate and cautious—at any rate, for a time—and also have furnished that very weapon for the half-educated against infidelity which we have spoken of above. For, however far apart the extremes on both sides are, yet the moderate men often come very close to one another. Few deny the composite authorship of the Pentateuch; many are quite prepared to admit that some later laws have been ascribed to Moses. Professor Sayce himself ("Higher Criticism and the Monuments") admits mistakes in chronology in the Books of Kings; mistakes in persons—*e.g.*, in calling Seve King of Egypt; that the story of Esther is an example of Jewish Haggadah; and that the Book of Daniel is not historical. For some "traditional views" these admissions are as bad in principle as the "new position" of the Higher Critics. The writers in "Lex Mosaica" take no notice of all this. They should have laid down clearly both what they defend and what they attack; but they have not done so.

Secondly, the defence of the "tradition view,"

besides being often very weak, sometimes proceeds on different and even inconsistent lines. The Higher Critics will, of course, say the defence is weak because the case is weak; but it becomes weaker still when the various writers answer one another. Take, for instance, the argument of Mr. Watson relative to the non-observance of the Law in the days of David and Solomon (pp. 282, 283): "We must," he says, "at the onset fully admit that many of the provisions of the Mosaic Law seem to be systematically disregarded in David's and Solomon's reigns. The separation of the Ark from the Tabernacle, involving substantial anomalies in Israel's worship, is overwhelming proof of this Furthermore, David and Solomon have a sacerdotal character not in accordance with the priestly code, and two of David's sons are called priests. Assuming the Law's existence, ought we to expect exact obedience to it when good and strong kings like David and Solomon were on the throne? The critics assume that we ought. Neglect by pious Jews of any of the Law's prominent precepts is regarded as *primâ facie* evidence that these have not come into existence. There seems to us to be strong reasons to the contrary. In the first place, the plea of ignorance must be regarded as having great force. There were great obstacles in the way of knowledge of the Law. It was not in circulation in any sense of the word. Existing possibly in one copy only, which was laid by with something of superstitious reverence in the side of the Ark, it was inaccesible to the few who could read. The priests seem utterly to have failed to realise the hope expressed by Moses, 'They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments and Israel Thy Law.' The well-known story of Luther's surprise at the contents of Holy Scripture shows the possibility of ignorance under circumstances immeasurably more favourable to knowledge. General acquaintance with the Law seems out of the question. Josiah's ignorance of its precepts can hardly be regarded as isolated and unprecedented." Now to this we must say that it is a pure assumption that there was only one copy of the Law. Even if that be granted, surely a law regarded with such "superstitious reverence" would, as regarded its ritual observances, be handed down by oral teaching. And there is all the difference in the world between a plain violation of ritual and prerogative—like David's making priests of his sons—which men are generally willing to obey, and the neglect of ethical duties, which always have been and are disobeyed. But, waiving all this, Mr. Watson's argument does not harmonise with the contention of other writers in the book that the Law *was* known. Page after page in "Lex Mosaica" contends that the prophets were thoroughly acquainted with the Mosaic legislation. Professor Stanley Leathes and others contend that the prophets who were King Josiah's contemporaries, and indeed those in preceding days, *did* know that very Law which Mr. Watson says it was "out of the question" that he should know. Now it is obvious that both cannot be right; or, in other words, the writers answer one another.

Thirdly, and most important, we greatly regret the way in which Christ's quotations of the Old Testament, as reported in the Gospels, are appealed to as deciding the question of authorship. We regret this on many grounds. Surely, to begin with, history should have taught the unwisdom of this procedure. A theory of the inspiration of Scripture was invoked as a weapon to crush Galileo; and again, in our own times, to silence Darwin; in each case with disastrous results — to the theories. Surely also experience should teach that men will not thus be silenced. Even the "plain man," who commonly distrusts logical subtleties, knows that theories must give way to facts, not facts to theories. And, further, the Church, no Church, has exactly defined the limits of our Saviour's knowledge as man. If, therefore, *a* theory of Christ's human knowledge has, because of Higher Criticism, to be reconsidered, and possibly even abandoned, it will not be the theory of the Church, or at any rate not of the Church of England, but of the writers in "Lex Mosaica," and those who agree with them, which is not the same thing. And we would remind these writers that there is another theory of Christ's human knowledge which is quite compatible with the results of Higher Criticism. We cannot at the end of a review begin a discussion on this admittedly immensely difficult question; but we may refer to Dr. Plummer's *most able* article in the *Expositor* for July, 1891, and to another which preceded it, by Canon Travers Smith, in the *Expositor* for August, 1890; and also to a sermon by the Bishop of Manchester, published in our own columns on 21st March, 1891,

Our limits are exhausted; we can only repeat the purport of our remarks relative to Professor Schultz's "Old Testament Theology," that in the end criticism, finding out facts, will thus both destroy error and build up the kingdom of Him who is the Truth. But that end may be far off. At present, Oxford and Cambridge professors are teaching what a large minority, if not a majority, of the clergy call infidelity. Mr. Valpy French and Canon Driver write about one another in the tone of rival politicians. The clergy, especially those with large parishes and little leisure, are perplexed, hardly knowing what to teach; the faith of the laity has received a severe shock. The consequences must be disastrous. But the Bishops and those in authority give no guidance, and not much real help, we regret to say, will be gotten from "Lex Mosaica."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE.

SIR,—My corrected proof must have arrived, I fear, a post too late. The words quoted from the "Principia" should read, "From a *blind* metaphysical necessity," etc.; and I should like to have reminded your readers that Voltaire deemed Newton one of the greatest of mankind, while Darwin speaks of his achievement as "the greatest discovery ever made by man." Also I had intended to point out that "the vast geological *æons*, with their one fore-ordained progressive life-plan slowly advancing to perfection," prove that prophecy is to be found in Nature as well as in Scripture; that "things to come" are graven in the records of the rock as well as written in the pages of Revelation. These bygone ages of the world, which geology has so recently brought to light, help the Christian, who is taught that in Christ "the Life"—"that Eternal Life which was with the Father"—"was manifested unto us," to realise that this present age, in which sin is rampant and death reigns, will pass and make way for a better order of things, in which the Christ-life and no other will prevail—as surely as the

glacial age has vanished and the age of the great reptiles has gone for ever, giving place to the age of the mammals (1 John i. 1, 2).

That highly distinguished man of science, Sir Richard Owen, said: "The archetypal idea was manifested in the flesh . . . . upon this planet long prior to the existence of those animal species that actually exemplify it." That very eminent surgeon, Sir Charles Bell, wrote: "There is not only a scheme or system of animal structure pervading all classes of animals which now inhabit the earth, but . . . . the principle of this great plan of creation was in operation, and governed the formation of those animals which existed previous to the revolutions that the earth has undergone. . . . . The excellence of form now seen in the skeleton of man was in the scheme of animal existence long previous to the formation of man, and before the surface of the earth was prepared for him or suited to his constitution, structure, or capacities." Dr. Whewell, in his masterly "History of the Inductive Sciences," has observed: "There is another aspect of the doctrine of the archetypal unity of composition of animals, by which it points to an Intelligence from which the frame of Nature proceeds, namely this: that the archetype of the animal structure, being of the nature of an idea, implies a mind in which this idea existed: and that thus homology itself points the way to the Divine Mind." So, too, with regard to evolution, Mr. Gladstone has said: "Does not reason require us to go further, to turn the tables on the adversary, and to contend that evolution by how much it binds more closely together the myriad ranks of the living—aye, and of all other orders—by so much the more enlarges and enhances the true argument of design and the entire Theistic position?"

The only true evolution, however, is the gradual evolution of God's "eternal purpose," "to gather together in one all things in Christ," "Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for us" (Eph. i. 10, iii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 20).

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 27th, 1895.

PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS TO DISSENTERS.

SIR,—May I be allowed, in connection with remarks recently made in the House of Commons, touching Parliamentary grants to Church and Dissent, to remind your readers that the late Lord Selborne, than whom there was no greater or more conscientious authority, stated that the grants made by Parliament to Dissenters from the year 1690, including those to Irish Presbyterians (but not Scotch), amounted to no less than £2,637,409, whereas the aggregate amount of grants to the Church of England was but £2,600,000—namely, £1,500,000 towards church building, and £1,100,000 to Queen Anne's Bounty Fund; therefore Dissenters have had £37,000 more from Parliament than the Church of England?

G. H. F. NYE.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alexander, Rev. Edward Percy, M.A., Vicar of Alvanley; Organising Secretary for the Archdeaconry of Chester of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

Alford, Rev. Allan Cameron, M.A., Rector of Aston Sandford, Thame; Vicar of Cuddington, Bucks.

Bayfield, Rev. M. A., M.A., Head Master of Christ College, Brecon; Head Master of Eastbourne College.

Beckles, Right Rev. E. H., D.D., Vicar of St. Peter's, Bethnal-green; Chaplain of Hastings Workhouse.

Brearley, Rev. J. Barnes, M.A., Vicar of Burscough, Ormskirk; Acting Chaplain to the Forces at Burscough.

Carruthers, Rev. C., M.A., Rector of Duncton; Rector of Up-Waltham, Sussex, by dispensation.

Crawley, Rev. H. H., B.A., Curate; Rector of Stowe-Nine-Churches, Weedon.

Davis, Rev. T. H., Mus.Bac., Curate of St, Mary's, Warwick; Priest-Vicar of Wells Cathedral.

Easterling, Rev. T. A., Chaplain at Marsala; Chaplain at Elham Union.

Fleming, Rev. Arthur Evelyn, M.A., Minor Canon of Gloucester Cathedral; Precentor of Gloucester Cathedral.

Glennie, Rev. William Bourne, M.A., Junior Chaplain of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh; Minor Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

Griffith, Rev. Clement W. H., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Bathwick, Bath; Rector of Winthorpe, Newark.

Hall, Rev. Joseph William, Curate; Rector of Addingham, Leeds.

Heal, Rev. W. Reece, late Rector of Chelsworth, Suffolk; Vicar of St. Paul's, Shepley, Huddersfield.

Henderson, Rev. J. D., M.A., Curate of Fetcham; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester.

Henry, Rev. James, Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Birmingham; Joint Honorary Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for Birmingham.

Hodgson, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Whitchurch, Hants; Honorary Minor Canon of Winchester Cathedral.

Homer, Rev. Frederic William, A.K.C.; Vicar of Chearsley, Bucks.

Jones, Rev. J. Hatton, M.A., Senior Curate of Moseley, Worcestershire; Vicar of Great Wilbraham, Cambridge.

Lewis, Rev. L. Elwyn, Curate-in-Charge of Fosdyke, Boston; Rector of Fyfield, Essex.

Meakin, Rev. William Astbury, Curate of Stone, Staffs; Perpetual Curate of Withington, Shrewsbury.

Morgan-Brown, Rev. N. M., M.A., Minor Canon; Head Master of the Cathedral Choir School.

Nanson, Rev. Walter Lionel, Chaplain at Panch Howds, Poona; Vice-Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta.

Peck, Rev. John, M.A., Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Boulogne-sur-Mer; Chaplain of the Holloway Sanatorium, Virginia Water.

Ranken, Rev. C. E., M.A., St. Ronan's, Malvern; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Worcester.

Rowley, Rev. James Farmer, Curate of Stourpaine, Blandford; Perpetual Curate of St. Giles's, Bramhope, Leeds.

Ruegg, Rev. F. S., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Todenham; Chaplain to the Shipston Union.

Wauchope, Rev. D., M.A.; Vicar of New Bilton, Rugby.

Waugh, Rev. J. H., M.A., Minor Canon of Worcester Cathedral; Rector of Harvington, Evesham.

Webster, Rev. J., M.A., Rector of Martin-Hussingtree; Vicar of Ombersley, Droitwich.

Willis, Rev. F. W., M.A., Rector of Warrington; Honorary Canon of Liverpool.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Boodle, Rev. Adolphus, Vicar, at Little Addington Vicarage, Thrapstone, on the 28th ult., aged 78.

Bowden-Smith, Rev. Philip, for forty-three years Assistant-Master at Rugby School, at Rugby, on the 1st inst., aged 67.

Daman, Rev. Charles, formerly Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, Oxford, at Romsey, on the 2nd inst., aged 81.

Deane, Rev. William John, M.A., Rector of the Parish for forty-two years, at Ashen, Essex, on the 30th ult., aged 71.

Higginson, Rev. John, M.A. for fifty-nine years Rector of the Parish, at Thormanby Rectory, Easingwold, on the 30th ult., aged 83.

Marston, Rev. Edward, M.A., for thirty-two years Rector of Holy Trinity, at Chester, on the 28th ult., aged 75

Morton, Rev. William, Canon of St. Asaph, at Mildmay-park, N., on the 31st ult., aged 60.

Warren, Rev. S. L., for twenty-five years Rector of Esher, on the 29th ult., aged 59.

The Church of England Pulpit.

DOGMA AS A SOCIAL FORCE.

BY CANON H. SCOTT-HOLLAND.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. MARY'S-LE-STRAND, ON MARCH 25TH, 1895, IN CONNECTION WITH THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UNION.

"And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?"—1 COR. xiv. 7-12.

"ORTHODOXY is my 'doxy," so the phrase runs. Yet that is exactly what it cannot be. If its only claim lay in its being mine, it could never claim to be orthodox. By making that claim it asserts that it is not mine, but yours. The word would be absolutely devoid of all meaning if right thinking were merely individual, just as truth would have ceased to exist if it were what each man troweth. So far as it is this it is nothing; it has not begun to be. To use the name of truth is to assert that we can set the limits of each man's private troweths, and can arrive at some conclusion independently of him who thinks it, and which is common to all who think. If such a result is unattainable, then you have despaired of truth. Nothing then can be more ridiculous than to claim orthodoxy for a private opinion. If religion is the concern of the individual spirit, of course then there is no such thing as orthodoxy; each worships alone with his God; each answers to himself alone before God for what he troweth. There may be in some a noble sensitiveness which recoils from all outward expression of its spiritual communion, too sadly conscious of its inadequacy to convey by any language to others, or even to itself, the mystery that is nevertheless so solemn and so sweet. Such nobility of spiritual sentiment speaks to us, I suppose, in its best form from the heart of Arthur Clough, who, shrinking from the ruthless and clamorous logic with which Ward hammered at the door of his delicate soul, fled apart to murmur in timorous solitude that unhymned hymn which can only utter itself in prayer by praying in apologies for prayer, and cannot presume to name what it prays to without withdrawing the very name without which it cannot utter its prayer.

> O Thou that in our bosoms shrine
> Dost dwell, unknown because divine!
> * * * *
> O Thou in that mysterious shrine
> Enthroned, as I must say divine!
> I will not frame one thought of what
> Thou may'st either be or not,
> I will not prate of "thus" and "so"
> And be profane with "Yes" or "No";
> Enough that in our soul and heart
> Thou, whatso'er Thou may'st be, art;
> * * * *
> Do only Thou in that dim shrine,
> Unknown or known, remain divine,
> Be Thou but there in soul and heart,
> I will but ask to feel Thou art.

So it has all been said, in its most perfect and most manly form. But then the very emotion which stirs in us at the reading of such a poem comes from the fact that the soul which argues on behalf of this worldless faith recognises and confesses its own pathetic impotence. Such a religion, as it tells us, is but the uttermost refuge of a wistful soul that cannot quite abandon itself to despair of God. It is aware of all that it has lost, it can but humbly apologise for what remains. It offers us no gladness, for it cannot go with the multitude to keep holy-day. It creeps away, therefore, into some unnoticed corner under the grey shadows, and tenderly it pleads against surrendering its frail last hope pitifully conscious, as it tells us, of

> Fingering idly some old Gordian knot,
> Unskilled to sunder and too weak to cut,
> And with much toil attain to half belief.

Yet seriously and tragically it will go apart still in silence, and will bend itself in a prayer that must perforce be speechless to One Who not unowned shall, unnamed, forgive, and be content in prayerlessness to work so that the work itself may become the prayer that it cannot pray. So tender, so touching it all is; and the pity lies just in this—that such religion must perforce abide secreted and unshared. It abideth alone. Only by speech can it shatter its dismal solitude; it must discover some word which can embody for it its belief if it is ever to convey it to another. A wordless faith is a lonely faith.

Surely, then, my brethren, if that be so, religion has all but foresworn itself if it has abandoned its claim to lift men out of their loneliness. Religion is in its vital essence the spirit of unity, the spirit of combination, the spirit of brotherhood. Its primary office is to overleap these barriers that shut men's souls off from one another. In religion, if anywhere, men must find their common identity; its entire aspiration is set towards that way; and that is why the whole religious movement of mankind, being, as it is, an effort, an impulse after spiritual unity, attains its true consummation in the revelation of one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all. A religion that cannot bring together even so much as two souls into a common faith is but the vacant ghost of a religion haunting its own grave. It has ceased to retain the character that stamped it religion; and a religion that cannot name its God is powerless to arrive even at a brotherhood of two. The sole

bridge by which we can pass across the gulf that sunders spirit from spirit is speech; to co-operate, to associate we must speak. Destroy faith's power of speech, and you reduce it to the impotence of Babel; and our tower that should rise to heaven tumbles into ruins the moment combination ceases, and combination ceases as soon as language fails.

Here, then, is the alternative set before us. If we deny to spiritual belief its power to express itself, if we repudiate the formulæ of words in dealing with the secret communings of the soul, if we shrink from all outward expression of the mystery that we would nurse to ourselves alone, if we prefer some dumb, inarticulate cry of the soul which shrinks from all these attempts to name the ineffable Name, then, while cherishing our own freedom from the dust and heat of theological dispute, while hugging our own personally spiritual purity on which no stain or spot has fallen from these wild and silly wars that rage around holy things, we have all alone dropped out the heart of the matter; we have expunged from religion its inmost significance; we have surrendered its main hope; for we have stripped it of the only instrument by which it could fulfil its supreme office, the supreme office of knitting men together into a brotherhood: and we have won our own peace at the cost of finding it a solitude. Every religion, then, that is true to its primal instincts must offer to combine men together, and to combine men together it must take to itself all the risks of formulating a speech—a speech which its followers may understand, a speech by which it may convey to itself and to others that which it believes. And Christianity is above all religions bound to have gained this power of speech because, first, not only does it profess that combination is the very essence of its creed, so that faith in Jesus only exists in a corporate form as a society, a kingdom and family, and to believe at all men must believe in a Church; but also, by offering to make this association world-wide and universal, it drops out all those adventitious aids to combination which religions could rely upon only as long as they were national or local. A tie of blood would serve to combine men into a religion so long as religion and the race were co-terminous. But Christianity has thrown over all these incidental ties, and it must rely for coherence on purely spiritual acts which constitute the common speech of its united people.

Now I would use speech here in its wildest sense as meaning outward acts which embody and convey abroad an inward intention. Such sacramental speech in the deepest and highest sense is to be found and was found in the fixed actions of common public worship, done altogether, done by mutual agreement, conveying united assent. These form the primary, the most permanent, and in some ways the richest language in which a communion in belief becomes articulate and finds determined and intelligible expression.

And so Christianity took for its elemental speech the liturgy of the common feast of the one "altar of the Eucharist": fixed acts, fixed formulæ; these held together by public rehearsal, by public declaration in the public assembly, the entire body corporate of believers. In these unchanging and catholic forms everyone understood the same thing, everyone realised through these outward expressions his identity with his brethren in the one Body and the one Blood. Through these sacraments the invisible Church attained to its visible unity, souls mingled with souls, spirits touched spirits, as under such ritual they ate of one bread and drank of one cup. Here is the first high language that released the spirit from its loneliness. It had found its proper speech; it was made here one with its fellows. But this outward ritual could not be enough. This speech of liturgical action was bound to include the fixed use of selected, definite, and intelligible words; for a Christian's ritual could not lie at the level of some miserable pagan magic which asked no one to understand it, if only it were formally correct. The Christian must offer intelligent, reasonable service with his mind and with his spirit; he must know what he means by his acts; he must follow his public worship with reasoning assent, with thoroughly qualified understanding. And this is the unique note of Judaism and of Christianity that they alone, let us remember, of all religions of history, demand of the worshipper that he should think about what he is doing, and should bring his mind into full play in his worship. No pagan thinker asks that, or ever has asked it. To fail in this was to fail in loyalty to Him who was the Word, the reasonable mind, and Son of God. From the very start, therefore, every catechumen must have passed diligently through the intellectual training of the catechetical schools before could take place his confirmation in the corporate worship of the society. In the schools he learnt to apprehend authoritative dogmatic words, words gradually sifted out, and deliberately chosen, through which the society secured and maintained its coherence. He learnt to name the God in whom he believed by the name in which the associated and united worship of the entire Church made its appeal before the throne. The name of the Lord, that of old, was the force that made Israel a people; and the name given to Jesus, which is above every name, was the force which held the Church, and constituted all believers one people. The Name named, the Name understood, disclosed, laid open, pronounced, declared in intelligent words—this is that through which, by joints and bonds, the entire body, articulated and combined, grew with the growth of God. And then, as debate and dispute raged keenly round the Name in which the worship ascended, the Church, if she were to

cohere at all in face of the disintegrating talk, if she were to abide as an enduring society, was obliged to perforce not only to select her liturgical language yet more carefully, but also to define precisely what she meant by it. And that is dogma.

But just note what dogma means—not speculation, not philosophy, not metaphysics, not theological explanations at all. Dogma does not explain, dogma does not argue; dogma simply asserts—asserts facts, asserts facts that have been verified to believers through collective experience; it asserts what they have found to be true; it asserts what is already their life, and already their belief; it asserts what has already been intended by its familiar worship. Dogma is simply the declaration of what faith means by its faith. It has no authority whatever over unbelievers, and claims none. It is simply an assertion by Christian believers of what it is that they in common do, or affect, hold and believe. Dogma, then, is the act of the body, and of the believing worship of the Church. It is the answer to the question. What is it that this Christian body means by worshipping Jesus Christ in its public assemblies and in its liturgical acts? As a body it certainly does so worship, does it always in one way, in corporate eucharistic action which must have a valid and universal significance to those united. What is the significance? Does it involve that it should be the means of approach to the Father, and the only means?

The dogmatic creeds were the answer given by the Church to the theological discussions of the fourth and fifth centuries. In these she announces simply the mind with which she habitually worships, she clears off doubtful terms, hazy expressions, which she finds would wreck her power to pray to God through Jesus Christ in her historical and undeviating forms as she had always done. That is her dogma, and to deny her the right and capacity to dogmatise can only mean the denial of the Church's power to say what it is she believes, and what she understands by her worship; it is to say that her faith must be inarticulate, must be unthinkable; it is to say that reason can have no part or lot in Christian worship, that no one can have any brotherhood in the faith. Of course, that may be true enough; and if it is, if faith must remain a buried secret, a blind emotion hushed up in the inner recesses of an individual spirit, unable to emerge into public view, then the existence of Christianity as an organic society, as a coherent body, as a social force, that can combine and unite in any consistent movement so as to take in mankind at large, is at an end. In dogma Christianity declares what it means by belief. If it cannot say even to itself what it means, then it has no capacity for combination; its members cannot associate in united action; its corporate construction falls away into ruins. And that, my brethren, is, to my mind, the issue which is so serious. Men are turning their eyes to-day anxiously to see whether in the midst of our social state, strained as it is by industrial perplexity, wearied, over-burdened, and beclouded, whether there be present here on earth a holy society in which God has set up His throne, whose members, trained and fashioned in a heavenly city, can bring to bear on social difficulties the mind of those who know what corporate citizenship and the responsibilities of human brotherhood should mean. You and I believe that such a city of God exists, and that its citizenship is the school in which we can best learn how to serve our earthly city, and how to love our fellow-men. But such a society, if it is to be what we imagine, cannot base itself on the elimination of dogma; such a society cannot cohere if it does not possess a constructive, unifying mind, which can animate the body with a fixed purpose; such a society cannot cohere if its members cannot communicate with one another, cannot share together a common faith which is intelligible and can be conveyed in common speech. They must, if they are to have any social force as an integral mass, be drawn together and compacted by the knowledge of Him in whom they have believed. There must be Christian language that passes between Christian souls by which they can realise this knowledge. Such language adds nothing to the faith, it only expresses what is already believed. But it does add power to the faith, just because it enables it to know itself, and to show it abroad. Faith in Jesus Christ can exist without power to speak; but it must then exist to itself alone and abandon all hope of winning the movement, and the swing, and the force of associated action. But if Jesus Christ intended to act on the world not through vague words, but through a kingdom—through the weight of a gathered body, then He must certainly have intended that body to speak, to understand its own meaning. And that understanding, that authoritative faith, is dogma.

There may be those to whom such speech is denied. Let them bear their burden bravely—bear it even as Zacharias bore it, although he was dumb for a season because he could not wholly believe. But let them realise that if that dumbness could break they would find their capacity for service doubled and redoubled; they would step up into that place in that ordered creation where all voices are organic and distinct; they would strike hands with their brethren in the faith; they would be glad as Zacharias was glad on the day when his mouth was opened and his tongue was loosed, and he spake and praised God.

THE Bishop of Newcastle sailed on the 5th inst. by the *Majestic* for New York. His lordship is taking the voyage for the benefit of his health.

THE EASTER REVELATION.

By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Easter Day, 1895.

"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept."—1 Cor. xv. 20.

WHAT a shout of joy there is in that word "now," with which the Apostle opens out into His glorious theme of the Resurrection. There it had been struggling to get out, through discords and obscuring passages of controversial doubt, this great theme of the Apostolic Gospel; now caught up and dragged down by the cries of those who say there is no resurrection of the dead; down deeper into the sombre depths of a false witness to God, of a tragic mistake in estimating evidence; down into a gloom, where the holy dead lie only as so many perished lives, crushed by sin, and a challenge to despair. We hardly trace a note of the first inspiration in the dismal discord of broken hopes and fooled expectations. "If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

But it is there at this point that the resurrection theme bursts out, rising above and upon the shifting discords, and opening up out of the passages which ended only in woe. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept." Christian preaching was not a proclamation of meaningless and empty messages, not a principle incapable of producing any good results; God's messengers were not false witnesses; the Christian dead were not perished; Christian life was not a hollow sham, a cunningly devised fable. All was safe, all was bright; the brighter because the very discordance of the doubt could only open out into this. Christ was risen, His people should also rise.

I.—And yet the Apostle is true to history in this triumphant contrast of glory following on gloom. He himself in his conversion had inverted the order: Christ had appeared to him in glory, in blinding flash and overwhelming utterance, to send him to trace back a great anti-climax of life, through suffering, contumely, a despised Gospel, prison, and a criminal's death—a sequence which he himself seemed to recognise when he said, "That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings." The glory of the resurrection first, the fellowship of the sufferings afterwards. But to the first Christians and to the Apostles it had been otherwise. They had been associated with a Man who had gone up to the ills of life one by one and emptied them of their misery. If they had thought in their fishing trade of a hard life, which depended on so many vicissitudes, and sometimes, perhaps, had left them in doubt, for the ordinary provisions of life, Christ had gone up to poverty and called it a blessed state, and they had accepted it. If they had dreamed of ambitious schemes or a position of power, or a throne in a Messianic kingdom, Christ had emptied once for all such hopes of any attractiveness, and had promised possession to meekness and a kingdom to humility, and they had accepted it.

He had met disease over and over again, and wakened it into health. He had restored the ravages of sin, and unloosed the knots of doubt. But they had lived to see Him encounter death in His own Person, not in the person of son or daughter or friend; they had seen the dark water rise higher, in pains just as we feel, in loss of power, in separation from friends, in loneliness; one by one the correspondences of life were snapped off. Under a darkened sky and on a quaking earth the earthly tie breaks, and the Saviour is dead, the Christ is powerless, the hope of Israel is gone. All just the same as with ordinary mortals—the grave, the seal, the stone. Here it is just as the Apostle described—the shrieking discord, the jangling notes, the confused passages, the inextricable error. Christ is dead, our preaching is vain, our faith is vain, false witnesses of God. The blessed dead have perished. We have hoped in Christ, and this world has snapped off that hope; we are of all men most miserable.

But now, with a burst of glory, riding on the storm, and framed in the depths of gloom, Christ is risen. The last enemy, which seemed so victorious, is destroyed. Christ has been raised, and not merely as He was before, but the firstfruits of them that are asleep; Christ has risen the same, and yet not the same as He was before. He died with a body adapted to the world of sense; He rose with a body adapted to the world of spirits—the firstfruits of them that are asleep, and, therefore, the earnest of the same victory for ourselves. No longer with a body in which He hungered and thirsted and suffered, but in a body fitted with a different correspondence altogether, where the deadly blight of man's sins could no longer inflict suffering, even when they had been powerless to lodge temptation.

It is something of this joy, dear brethren, that we feel at Easter. It is not merely a selfish festival in which we see a way out of a great trouble, the engulphing jaws of death; it is not merely the festival which lights up with a blessed glow the pathos of sharp separations and the buried hopes which lie beneath the churchyard sod. There is to the Christian more than this: there is a ring of triumph in the "now" which ushers in Easter after the strange discords of the Passion and the sombre gloom of Good Friday. The Church accurately reflects the adoring thankfulness of the Christian soul, which hastens to put the diadem of Easter in place of the sharp crown of Good Friday, and to

welcome with the genuine glow of a personal love the triumph of our Redeemer and the reversal of the verdict of Calvary.

II.—Still, for all that, we are allowed to welcome in Easter a revelation where a revelation alone could help us; the veil between us and death is as heavy and inpenetrable as was the stone which kept the holy women from their pious purpose; and Easter lifts up for us as much as we may know, as much as it is good for us to learn, of the mystery of life beyond the grave. And we see Christ coming back from the grave, the firstfruits of them that slept—no ghost of His former Self. In the ancient world, when the longing for a life beyond the grave expressed itself in poetry, the son who seeks to embrace his father in the land of spirits finds that he is only embracing a shadow. But it was no shadow that breathed peace in the upper room, and left behind Him that commission of power which still works mightily in the Church. It was no phantom which during forty days worked out for the Apostles the polity of the Christian Church. It was no phantom which stood by the shore of the lake and cheered the fishermen to fresh effort and partook of their meal. It was Christ Himself. St. John, the eagle-eyed Apostle, only gives expression to our convictions when he cried out, "It is the Lord." Neither did Christ come back from the dead in another nature into which His human soul had been transferred out of the universal life into which it had been absorbed at death. It was no migatory soul, it was no new manifestation of soul out of the great heart of the universe;—no, once more, it was Christ Himself, Who returned, with this difference—that now there belonged to Him a fresh glory of correspondence; a resurrection body, adapted to a resurrection life. Christ dies in His human nature; the same Christ rises again in a body corresponding to that in which He first lived on the earth. On Easter Day, then, we have a fresh hold on that "I," "myself," my own personality, that strange mixture of powers, influences, victories, catastrophes, and possibilities which God started in the world when He sent me here, and which Easter tells me will go on for ever. Now, I can never cease to be, I cannot step aside, and be forgotten, or be lost in the crowd. It is an Easter message for weal or for woe. We may live with God. We must live for ever. Look at Jesus Christ stepping down into this world with its living stream. There is the strong bias towards evil setting off from the sin of our first parents, still a living force, which He grapples with and arrests, but only through death. The faith of Abraham is still alive for Him, the God-guided life of Israel, the preparation of prophets, the teaching of types. Greek wisdom flows by on the current, Roman discipline, Eastern conquests still throb in its waters. Men and women, passing and repassing, shed from their paths the ripple of fashion, or custom, or tradition. And into this Christ came. He corresponded to it. Through human memory and Divine consciousness He was linked on to the past. Human experience moulded His human character; He goes to the marriage feast and knows sympathy; He meets sin, disease, and death, and knows sorrow; He is buffeted by the waves of this troublesome world, and knows pain; the marks of the storm are upon Him; He is "the Man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief." And then as He passes through death, sin and sorrow have no power to leave their marks upon His sinless nature; He corresponds now to all that is spiritual, and peaceful, and heavenly in human nature; He deals with the spirit of man with sacramental grace, with higher developments, with the Church; and He passes from our sight ever to live, to make intercession for us.

So it has been, so is it with each of us. God puts us into this wide-reaching life, whose tides sweep by us out of a past lost in the mists of history and eddy away into eternity. Here He has attached us as it were to this great life. And we never can cease to be, or lose our personality. To this life we correspond as natural bodies, to the life hereafter we shall correspond as spiritual bodies, and so we draw life from our surroundings; the stream as it passes us, too, is alive with the life of the past. As soon as we are conscious, the living taint of Adam's sin wakes up strong within us. The faith which mounts up in our hearts is alive with the faith of ages of believing souls who have gone before us. For us, too, the wisdom and the discipline and the empires of the past shape the eddies which carry us on. And we draw life from our surroundings; we start with a nature which we have inherited from those who have gone before us; we are made and influenced by the life all around us—children of the age.

My brethren, what are we doing with life, which Easter tells us is so precious and so momentous in its issues? What are we doing with that rich heritage, which flows out to us, with those surroundings that mould us, that character which is gradually being formed in us, that character by which "I" shall be known as a separate person through all eternity? Ah, my brethren, we know how people try to get away from themselves and to sink responsibility in what others say and others do. Not only do they err and stray like lost sheep, but they think and read, and follow fashion like sheep as well. We know how people dislike to be alone, and need constant amusement and constant means of forgetting themselves; but the time comes when they find themselves face to face with self, and with a self that cannot die. How strangely such legends as the Wandering Jew have impressed themselves on the imagination of mankind—where the sinner fain would die and lose himself and be forgotten, but cannot, and must live on, dead while he lives. It is a dread

type of the personality which never dies, and which lasts on into the other world.

Surely it is an Easter question for us to-day. How am I corresponding to the world of life all around me? what effect is it having on my character? Many, many souls, when they are conscious within of the evil tendency, instead of wrestling with it, as Christ wrestled with evil in the world, contentedly acquiesce in it, and say it is human nature, and more and more become degraded, are alive only to what is base and animal in the world. This Circe of an enchanting delusion that nature, as they call it, means unregulated desire, and was meant to be gratified, turns them into swine, and the world into a large sty of sensual gratification. Can the sensualist really hope that a life like his is to last for ever?

Or, others again meet those dread forces of pain and sorrow, those stern mothers of great virtues, the test and proof of the noblest graces, and they fail beneath them. Bowed down with pain and crushed with sorrow, they would fain curse God and die. For them, too, it is hardly a message of comfort, that life of which they knew so little, and which they so utterly dread, will last for ever.

It must have come across many a mind—after the first flush of youth is over, and disappointment has weighted the footsteps, and loss after loss has left them bare and lonely; as the sun dips below the horizon, and the night of death comes waving towards them as a stealthy mist which will enwrap them and stifle them in its folds. Would it not have been better never to have lived? Then I should never have felt this pain and this void, never have been paralysed with this gathering spectral gloom. It is then that we hear the trumpet-notes of the Apostle's, "Now is Christ risen from the dead."

It is then that we hear our Lord's own words which cheer us with their confident ring, "Blessed are the eyes that see the things that ye see, for I tell you that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see and have not seen them, and to hear the things which ye hear and have not heard them." It is better, if it be God's will, that we should be born to a life of sorrow, pain, disappointment, poverty, or loss than not to be born at all. Now, it may be, we are in correspondence only with those things which, in God's mercy, are to develop the richness and fulness of our character. When we have passed through death, our capacities will be made manifest. Then we shall know what is meant by satisfaction, by joy, by life itself; then we shall draw life from our surroundings without pain to distract, or sorrow to hinder, or sin to rob. "Complete in Him." I have read of an exquisite torture, which consisted of this—putting the unhappy prisoner in a cell, of which the floor, the ceiling, the walls, were all constructed of mirrors, so that he never could escape from himself until it worked upon his imagination and destroyed his reason. Never to die—it is a tremendous truth which carries with it a damnatory clause. Never to die—it is a glorious hope to one who has realised what life is, and the privilege and joy of living on as a person, in a kingdom of life, of being admitted to share in privileges which can only be developed in eternity.

III.—"The firstfruits of them that slept." Where our Forerunner has gone before, there, too, we hope to follow, and to find in death, not a dread necessity, to which we must bow, but a sleep with a glorious awakening, in which we have slept off the aching pains, the fatigue and weariness of buffeting with sin, and the fever of pleasures which never could satisfy. Only, if death is not to be an utter break, which will leave us to face the other world, bare and unready, we must learn surely now more than we have hitherto done to correspond with those bits of immortality which reach down into our daily life; in prayer we correspond with realities which death itself will not alter. Paradise itself is but a first Communion which lasts for ever. "If ye then be risen with Christ seek those things that are above." Easter, while it speaks to us of the continuity, speaks to us of the dignity, of life. Do not let us lead an artificial life and forget its true nobility and purpose. Do not mistake gaslight for the sun, or the heated room for the breath of heaven, or amusement for purpose, or recreation for the end of life. Perhaps where we most suffer is in want of seriousness of purpose, and a true recognition of life's dignity. "Children of the Resurrection" must feel that life was given them for something higher than amusement, and was capable of something better than a mere corresponding to comfort, or to the scientific production of luxury; that it cannot be right to be so absorbed in business as to produce spiritual atrophy, or to be so conformed to this world as to lose the higher capacities altogether. Banter is a sorry substitute for wit, criticism of others a poor form of conversation; life which is a recurring scene of pleasure, varied with excitement, a travesty of the earnest purpose, which begins here to work for eternity. Perhaps we hardly realise the damage that is done to our life by letting ourselves go without restraint, while we allow life to lose its dignity when it loses its purpose; when happiness is dissipated by an intoxication of pleasure, which leaves us when the spell is over the sadder and the more weary, ready to offer a prize for a new pleasure, or decorate the discoverer of a new sensation.

It is sad to see so many Samsons, with their God-given strength, when Philistines menace on all sides, shorn and weakened and blinded, in a world which first has flattered, then captivated, and then betrayed. It is sad to see still many a Saul, who started as king of men, head and shoulders above the surrounding throng, tam-

pering with allegiance, failing slightly in his duty, then failing deeper, and drifting on into the gloom where God is not, and only necromancy and superstition sit like ghosts upon the ruined altars which once were inhabited by the Spirit. It is sad to see David passing from the confident step of innocent boyhood into an old age rifled by sin, an example of penitence for a life which had failed, instead of a living monument of a soul alive unto God, and swept by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Surely Easter Day tells us with no uncertain voice that life must be rescued from that cruel foe, which exacts day by day its harsh task, and promises to pay us happiness from coffers long known to be empty, and from resources long proved to be bankrupt, and that the correspondence must be set up with things which have in them an element of eternity. It is a sad experience with many a soul that Easter, the festival of the Resurrection, only ushers in a return to the state of spiritual torpor, which was galvanised into a semblance of life by the observance of Lent. There is still a large belief in some minds that fasting means fasting from sin, and that, now Lent is over, it is possible to go back with impunity to those habits which, if they are not wrong, cannot be said to be right. The old rule is torn up, and we drift on again through days littered with waste of opportunities, on each side of which there rise up those banks of *débris*, work spoiled left undone, opportunities missed, good works tainted which we grind off as we slowly slip down the mountain side of life. More strange than all, how many now Lent is over will largely contract their devotions and their religious exercises, as if one form of penance, only suitable to Lent, was going to church. But children of the resurrection, those who believe in a life one and unending, know that it is just in these things they must keep up the correspondence with true and holy things which Lent adjusted; then when the sleep of death is over, then the pain which is pleasure and the pleasure which is pain will begin of seeing God. And that power of seeing Him should be cultivated here in the heart which will not deliberately admit the obscuring element of even one sin. Lent, if it has taught us anything, should have taught us that pleasure is satisfaction, and the highest pleasure the highest satisfaction, and that the satisfaction of the spirit is the highest satisfaction, and that the imagery of the book of Revelation, which seems to represent heaven as one large temple, and life as one long service, may, after all, be not so incredible or impossible as it seems to be at first sight. Here, too, we have felt something of the joy of a resurrection which follows on the weariness of struggle. Here we have found that we have not been taken in, that the higher claims of Christianity are not visionary and impracticable, that the sermons of centuries are not reiterations of an at last exploded error, that the blessed dead did not die resting on a delusion, or pass through a struggle which they might easily have avoided.

We have not made ourselves miserable to no purpose, nor imagined sin when there was none, nor taken up a cross when we should rather have taken up the staff of a vigorous life. We have felt that out of the struggle, out of the sorrow, out of the self-restraint life has been holier, wiser, and better. And that now we are taking our places for eternity, building on the one foundation of a life which has been laid, even Jesus Christ, no flimsy erection of wood, hay, stubble, which shall be burned up by the cleansing fire to our great and abiding loss ; but a life's work which shall abide, in which God Himself has become known to us in sacrament and prayer, so that when we go out from this world, in obedience to death's summons, we do not go out from Him, but go to a fuller and richer correspondence, with a richer and fuller life, from which pain, temptation, sin, and failure have fallen away, and have left us the full and perfect enjoyment of His Presence. "Christ the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming."

THE Bishop of Colchester has been presented by the Rural Deans and clergy of the Archdeaconry of Essex with an address of congratulation and good wishes upon his appointment. The address, which assumed the form of an album, was engrossed and illuminated on vellum.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Watchfulness. Read Matt. xxiv. 42-45. Introduction.—We are reminded in this portion of Holy Scripture to be watchful, especially when we consider the uncertainty of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ and the dangers around us, our lives in this mortal state being uncertain. We cannot tell what a day may bring forth. After the different things which Christ has been telling in this solemn chapter as to the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, and the terrible things that would come to pass, He concludes with the important and imperative command, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour (or what day) your Lord may come." No one can tell the hour or day when we may be called. It matters not, so long as we are ready and found waiting, watching is far more important than to be speculating, as some dogmatic prophets are doing, in saying when Christ will come, or the end of this dispensation ; for be it known there is none that can tell with absolute accuracy when that time will be. What we are told is to "watch." What has that to do with us? Follow Christ, the future belongs to God. He will do all things right, and all that He has said in Holy Scripture will come to pass. Not one jot or tittle will fail. But there are things too deep and hidden, infinite things to solve. There are problems which the greatest Biblical scholars cannot make plain to human interpretation. Notice a few practical lessons:—1. Be watchful, watching and praying. 2. Secret things belong to God. 3. Life is full of uncertainties. 4. Follow Christ now. 5. Christ will give all we need. 6. Those in Christ are safe. —THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1895.

STATE AID.

THE next Government will have to solve the interesting problem of how to satisfy the natural demands of the Voluntary Schools. The position of these schools at present is that they constitute an additional and unfair tax upon all people, not necessarily Church people, who desire to have their children taught to worship according to the faith of their fathers. We will here waive the question of Board School competition, of departmental prejudice, and so forth. Quite apart from all this, the Voluntary Schools contend for the principle that parents have a right to religious education for their children, and to select that religious education for themselves. The State has no right to compel it to be of one character, or of none.

Unhappily, in order to avoid the first kind of compulsion, the State has fallen into the second. The Board School system, as at present administered, ignores this right of parents, and insists that the religious education shall not be of any definite character. Parents who value forms of religion have therefore been compelled to maintain Voluntary Schools where their children may be taught as they wish. And it speaks volumes for the importance which English people attach to this part of religious liberty, and for the sacrifices they are willing to make in its cause, that the greater part of the children of the nation are at this moment being educated in Voluntary Schools. It is a significant fact that hundreds of thousands of people all over England should be paying for the schools twice over rather than be deprived of this supreme parental right and responsibility. But their voices are now being heard, and it seems impossible much longer to resist the claim they make, that the public funds to which they contribute shall be applied to satisfy their requirements, and that the State exchequer shall make larger payments than it does in support of the Voluntary Schools. For many reasons it has seemed best to those who hold the brief for Voluntary Schools that the relief sought should come from the taxes rather than the rates, and therefore we now hear of a growing and authoritative demand for State aid for Voluntary Schools.

This has been stigmatised in the semi-official Radical Press as "dodging the ratepayers." It is thus that the party-hacks of journalism speak, for party purposes, of a scheme proposed by Archbishops and Bishops, and approved of by the heads of many great religious bodies. Political partizans seem to have sunk to this, that they can conceive no higher ideal than personal and party interests, and cannot imagine that any minds exist superior to party motives. It happens to-day that the heads of the Radical Party have committed themselves to hostility towards the Church of England. Therefore the Radical penny-a-liners are obliged professionally to denounce the Church. And it says much for the influence of our Church that religion is so identified with her, even in the minds of her enemies, that any movement in favour of religion is considered to be a movement in favour of the Church.

Out of animosity towards the Church the Radicals have set their faces as a flint against Voluntary Schools and the entire voluntary principle. By doing so they give another proof of how utterly distasteful is real liberty to the demagogue. The party of Progress and Equality, who are for disestablishing and disendowing the Church in the name of religious freedom, are in reality so much opposed to freedom that they are endeavouring to permanently set up a great religious disability, operating upon the greater portion of the nation, and affecting all creeds alike. They say, in effect, to the Churchman, "You shall not bring up your children to go to Church." And they say this, not to him alone, but to everybody; the Roman Catholic, the Wesleyan, the Presbyterian, are absolutely denied the right to teach their children in the State schools the essential and distinguishing characteristics of their faith. They may only do it at their own expense, and under all kinds of difficulties and disabilities. And this state of things commends itself to men who take in vain the sacred names of Liberty and Progress.

It cannot be too widely understood that all the Voluntary Schools are not of one denomination, and that the demand for State aid is not made in behalf of one or any particular denomination. A principle is involved which our opponents persist in ignoring. And the principle is, that every parent has a right to have

his children educated in his own creed; if the State takes education out of the hands of parents, it is bound to see that their natural rights are not disregarded, or the exercise of them penalised. The whole question of State aid turns upon this. In face of ignorance and opposition on the part of Radical party wire-pullers, who are, as usual, most positive in what they know least about, it must be explained that the defenders of Voluntary Schools are fighting the battle of the sects as well as the Church, and maintaining not merely the cause of religious equality, which is blasphemed by their opponents, but the cause of religion itself. It is this stand for a vital principle in our constitution that shallow-minded persons, to whom politics is only a game of counters, and who imagine that everybody else is as selfish and petty and unscrupulous as themselves, call "dodging the ratepayers."

CHURCH NOTES.

THE programme of the Church Congress at Norwich, to be held in the second week of October, which was published last week, is announced to be provisional. It may, therefore, be expected to undergo some modification. As it stands, it is sufficiently comprehensive. Education is rightly accorded a prominent place, and the report of the Archbishops' Committee on the question of State aid to Voluntary Schools will, of course, come under discussion. It can hardly be said that any of the subjects set down are new, and indeed it would puzzle the most ingenious and imaginative of minds to suggest a novelty after more than 30 years of congresses, in which every subject that can conceivably be related to the Church and its work has been debated. The only point that strikes us as really new is in the arrangements for the devotional meeting, at which considerations connected with the Second Advent are to hold an important place.

The Archbishop of York has addressed a sympathetic reply to the remonstrance of the clergy in the rural deanery of Doncaster on the subject of the extreme ritual practised in certain Doncaster churches. The tenour of the resolution, Dr. Maclagan says, and the limitations to which it refers are in entire accordance with the principles upon which he has uniformly acted during the 17 years of his episcopate. He believes there is little to complain of in his own diocese on the score either of extreme Ritualism or slovenly performance of Divine service. In the few cases in which he has had to interfere (not without good result) he has always endeavoured to bring his influence to bear rather by private exhortation than by public reproof.

The Archbishop adds, however, a word of caution. It must be remembered, he says, in all such matters that, whatever his private opinions or predilections may be, a bishop is bound to be scrupulously just, and even charitable, in his judgments, unmoved by the outcry of heated partisans or the irresponsible utterances of anonymous writers in newspapers. In conclusion, the Archbishop assures the clergy of his heartfelt sympathy with them in their dread of all that is disloyal to the Church of England or inconsistent with its teaching.

Dr. Maclagan, when he was at Lichfield, always cultivated friendly relations with the Nonconformists of his diocese, and on at least one occasion invited all the ministers to the Palace. He is acting on the same principle at York, and has announced his intention to invite the Dissenting ministers of the archdiocese to spend a day at Bishopsthorpe early next month. The Archbishop has just given a donation of £100 to help in providing the many poor clergy under his jurisdiction with a short holiday.

A colonial clergyman has been selected to succeed the late Dr. Sillitoe in the bishopric of New Westminster, British Columbia. The choice has fallen upon Dr. Dart, formerly of King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia, whose name is not very generally known in this country.

The Rev. Arthur H. Powell, who has been vicar for the last two years of St. John's, Waterloo Road, is going to St. Paul's, Maidstone. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the patron both of the Kentish vicarage to which Mr. Powell is going and of the London benefice which he vacates.

The living of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, which has just been vacated by the Rev. Henry Sutton, has, it is stated, been offered to the Rev. G. C. Williamson, Association Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. The living was formerly held, it will be remembered, by the Rev. R. W. Enraght, who was the victim of a long and tiresome prosecution for illegal ritual. The church has been for many years past in Evangelical hands.

The subject of Re-union was discussed last week by the Bishop of Ripon in his visitation charge. As was to be expected, Dr. Boyd Carpenter deals with the question on broad lines. If there is to be re-union, it cannot be on the basis of uniformity. It must be union in variety, with much difference of practice, ritual, and teaching. Any other union is impossible, undesirable, and un-Catholic. The wider our knowledge of the world and of races the more, says the bishop, will this be apparent. Christianity as a religion for man must possess elasticity and a self-adapting power which will enable it to deal with varying races. The Christianity of India must be a very different thing from the Christianity of America. We must be prepared to tolerate divergence from our established customs. Such concessions as the acknowledgment of this necessity involves do not, of course, require the surrender of any vital principle.

The working of the so-called voluntary system in America has often been shown to be a failure in providing the ministrations of religion for out-of-the-way districts. Churches, and very costly ones, are built in sufficient numbers in the big cities, but the villages are too apt to be neglected, or left to itinerant preachers of doubtful orthodoxy, if not objectionable on other grounds as well. The Rev. Josiah Strong, an American Congregationalist, and presumably, therefore, an opponent of national establishments of religion, has just published a book in which are to be found some very suggestive facts. Here are a few.

In the old and long-settled State of Maine, for example, there are ninety-five towns and plantations

where no religious services of any sort are held. It is less surprising to learn that there are more villages in Illinois without churches than in any other State in the Union. In one village, with two disused Protestant churches and one active Roman Catholic church, there are fourteen public-houses, all within a distance of a quarter of a mile. There were a few years ago in one town a large Presbyterian church, two Methodist churches, a Baptist church, and a flourishing Baptist seminary. To-day the Presbyterian church is used as a barn, the Baptist church is abandoned, the two Methodist churches are almost extinct, and the Baptist seminary is utilised as a Roman Catholic Church.

A story has been told of a woman in a remote district in the United States who replied to some pious observations of a passing traveller, "We ain't religious up here; we ain't got no opportunity." In view of such facts as these, which are stated to be given on official authority, we may well believe that there must be many thousands in the same condition. How many would there be, one wonders, in Wild Wales if the Church were disestablished and disendowed.

Regarding the effect of the Disestablishment Bill in Parliament, we are glad to have such a testimony as is given by Mr. J. G. Talbot in a letter to the *Guardian*. Mr. Talbot writes:—"In the twenty-seven years of my Parliamentary life I have never known a time in which more earnest support of the position of the Church, so as to enable her to do her high work, has been evoked in the House of Commons than since the attack on the four Welsh dioceses has been opened in earnest."

Whitsuntide is much more generally observed in Lancashire than in the South of England. Not only is the week a general holiday in the factories and many places of business, but it is especially sacred to Sunday school festivals. These begin on Whit-Monday with processions to the various places of worship, and it is stated that the Church schools procession in Manchester was this year the largest on record; nearly 24,000 children and young persons took part in it.

We read in the *Rock* that All Saints' Church, Old Swan (the vicar of which is the Rev. E. N. Hoare), is the first Liverpool church to go in for lady choristers wearing the new surplices and caps; let us hope it will be the last. The surplices are, we are told, quite unlike those used by the clergy; they are more like dolmans. The caps are of the shape worn by a D.C.L., and are made of violet velvet.

CANON MacCOLL ON THE INCARNATION.

On Wednesday, the 5th, Canon MacColl delivered the first of a series of lectures organised by the London Diocesan Church Reading Union, at SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., on the Wednesdays this month, at 1.15 p.m. He stated:—

All life passes through its stage of maturity, either on the right side or the wrong. As with organic life, so with ourselves. Man was created in a stage of immaturity; Adam fell before his nature was perfect. Just as parents now pass to their offspring not only physical, but also moral characteristics, so Adam's descendants come into the world biassed towards evil. But Christ, the second Adam, came as the second head of our race to engraft fallen humanity on a new stock. Now what is meant by the Incarnation? Simply that the Second Person of the Trinity took humanity into union with Himself. He did not take a "man" into union with Him, but "humanity." The distinction is vital. What He did was to create for Himself "by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary" a human nature. That was not a human person. Personality is not transmissible, and Christ, in taking human nature, took all the attributes of humanity, but not its personality; this enabled Him to be the perfect, the pattern Man.

He was, moreover, a representative man, not a Jew, nor a Greek, nor a Roman. In this He differs from all other founders of religions. They were members of particular races; He of the whole human race. There is no trace in His words or actions of any racial distinctions. Then Christ differs from other founders of religions in that He never once makes any confession of sin. Show us what was the character of a founder of a religion, and we shall be able to tell the character of the religion he founded. Buddha confessed himself a sinner; Buddhism will never become the religion of the world. Mahomet was a sensual man; Mohammedanism is sensual and cruel too. Now take the Gospels of Jesus Christ; they form four biographies of a perfect Man. They are the only biographies in the world that display a perfect man. Our only conclusion is that that perfect One could have been nothing less than Divine.

To conclude with a proverb: "*Noblesse oblige.*" Those who are nobly born have obligations of nobility laid upon them. Consider the dignity of our being born in Christ Jesus; our nature is a noble, a royal, a divine nature. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," said Christ. Yes, they shall see Him, not only hereafter, but here; not only in the majesty of nature, but also in the majesty of man. Shall man sin, then? or shall he tempt into sin another man in whom may dwell the divinity of Christ? God forbid, for in debasing humanity man debases that Divinity which came down from heaven at the Incarnation.

Next Wednesday Prebendary Shelford will lecture on "Miracles."

It is stated that a great many more persons than the church will accommodate have expressed a desire to be present at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on Sunday, July 21st, when Dean Farrar will preach his farewell sermon. The movement for presenting the chaplain to the House of Commons with some tangible testimonial is being supported by all classes. Among those who have joined the committee are the Bishops of London and Durham, Lord Ashcombe, Archdeacon Sinclair, the Speaker, Mr. Mellor, Sir John Lubbock, Sir Matthew White Ridley, Mr. Arnold Morley, Sir John Mowbray, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Colonel Howard Vincent, Sir Reginald Palgrave. Upwards of £400 has been received. The presentation, which will take the form of a purse of money, with, in all probability, a piece of plate setting forth the circumstances under which it is given, will be handed to Dr. Farrar at a public meeting at the Westminster Town Hall.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." June, 1895. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

PROFESSOR INCE'S paper on the "Miraculous Conception and Virgin Birth of Christ" is, he tells us, an answer to the controversy raised by Professor Harnack, whose book it seems has gone through thirty editions. The Professor does not mention the reading in "Codex Ludovicus," which also has attracted attention. It is an able paper. He wisely admits that not much stress is laid by the New Testament writers on the subject, and then conclusively shows why. We should have thought that even German professors would have had sufficient knowledge of human nature to know, but as they do not seem to know, Professor Ince tells them. One extract will show how well Professor Ince puts the argumentative side:—"Naturally in the Creeds the chronological historical order is followed. They begin with the Birth, they end with the Resurrection and Ascension. But in evangelical teaching we begin with the Resurrection as did the Apostles. They were first and above all things witnesses of the Resurrection; that admitted was a proof of the unique superhuman character of Jesus; that led back to the immediately preceding fact of His death by crucifixion, and the revelation therein of human guilt and Divine love and reconciliation between God and man. Then the life of heavenly teaching and beneficent activity would corroborate the impression of the stupendous facts in which it had culminated, and so the starting-point of the Divine Incarnation taught by the Church would naturally be found in an unique birth, a new beginning of the human race, from which was to germinate the new creation of man." That is very well put, but there is one point Professor Ince has not laid much stress on; we mean this: If the Miraculous Conception had been a legend it would have grown, for legends always grow. But it has not. St. John's Prologue is, on any theory of the origin and date of the Gospels, later than St. Luke's first two chapters. But St. John's statement that the Word of God, and the Word was made flesh, is much simplier than St. Luke's account or St. Matthew's reference to the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy, showing that even as late as the date of his Gospel, thoughtful minds preferred a reverent silence on a deep mystery. We cannot forbear quoting what Bishop Alexander says in "Leading Ideas":—"Some who have not lost all reverence for Christianity speak as if St. John's Prologue added a difficulty for faith, as of St. Matthew or St. Luke on the Incarnation were comparatively easy to receive. Is it so for those who think? Place side by side these statements. On the one side 'When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph before they came together she was found with a child of the Holy Ghost.' On the other side those four oracular propositions 'In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh.' Which is easier to receive? There have been profounded intellects who have confessed that the statement in St. Matthew almost repelled them. But every fact has its actual and its ideal aspect. In St. John the fact of the Incarnation is lifted up and flooded with the light of a Divine idea" (pp. 185, 186).

Professor Cheyne's paper on "Belial" contains no information and is not interesting. The papers by Professor Swete on "St. Jerome," on the "Psalms,' and by Professor Rendal Harris, entitled "A New Patristic Fragment," will be noted by students.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." June, 1895. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

THIS is a very good number, though no one of the papers it contains calls for any very special remarks. We are very glad to have more about Egypt from the pen of Mr. St. Chad Boscawen, but we miss the continuation of the papers on the "Epistle to the Romans." Dr. Davidson's paper on "Sirach's Judgment of Women" is also very interesting, but we do not altogether agree with it. We think Sirach knew the women he was writing about, and we also take a higher estimate of his book as a whole than Professor Davidson does. Its author was classed with the prophets by one of the Rabbin, and few books so little deserve the neglect into which it has fallen as the book called "Ecclesiasticus" which Hooker constantly quotes.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SLEEPLESS NIGHTS.

SIR,—It has occurred to me that some such plan as the following might be a help to those who lie night after night in sleepless waiting.

My idea is that we night-watchers should form ourselves into "a guild of night-worshippers," whose endeavour it shall be to utilise these hours which seem so useless—first, for the service of God, and secondly, in the service of each other; and in this way—When night descends, and these hours of sadness begin to close around us, let us each shut our eyes, and resolutely driving out of our thoughts worldly matters, pray to our Lord for help and blessing. Then let us picture to ourselves that we are entering in spirit into God's holy temple, there to meet the other members of our guild, coming like ourselves to offer, one and all, a night service of praise and thanksgiving. Let each bring their own offering of loving worship in there own way; no set service of any kind; but those who prefer a definite beginning might repeat the four short verses of Psalm cxxxiv.

Many of us, however, in these hours cannot—from pain, or weariness, or throbbing nerves—concentrate our attention sufficiently to follow any fixed Psalm or hymn. When this is the case no effort or strain should be made; it is enough to know that we have voluntarily come into our Father's house. From time to time we may be able to utter a few words of love and praise. The Holy Spirit will help us, and merely the feeling of worship will be enough to identify us with our fellow-worshippers and bring us comfort and peace.

Now for the second part of our work. I propose that we should have a leaflet printed monthly and

sent to each of us containing the names of our members, or numbers for those who may not wish their names given, and opposite each of these, where desired, a request for the prayers of other members, either for general or special blessings. Each of us as we enter in spirit into the temple might carry in with us some of these requests, and there might pray for our known or unknown sister to a loving Father and Lord, Who has bidden us to "pray one for another," and has promised that "where two or three are gathered together in His name He will grant their requests."

Some members might wish to write to each other and arrange to meet in spirit at this spiritual service, or several might "agree together" to ask for certain things.

May we not hope that with these two services to occupy our sleepless hours (praying for others who may be praying for us, and together praising and thanking God) we shall no longer feel useless and lonely? Will not our nights be light around us and sorrow and sighing flee away?

Who will join in forming this guild? Proposals to join may be sent to

E.

4, Lancaster Street, Hyde Park, London.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alston, Rev. J. W., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Cobridge, Stoke-on-Trent.

Arnold, Rev. Henry A., M.A., Rector of Barrow, Chester; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Chester (Mr. Hugh Lyle Smyth).

Barnes, Rev. C. H., Incumbent of St. Luke's, Yea, New South Wales; Incumbent of North and East Brighton, New South Wales.

Boggis, Rev. Robert James Edmund, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Clarke, Rev. Walter Sydenham, Curate of Slinfold; Rector of Upper Hardres, Canterbury.

Cornford, Rev. James, M.A., 1, Earlsfield-road, Wandsworth; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Rochester.

Davies, Rev. Charles Henry Rochfort, B.A., Assistant-Master at Wells Cathedral School; Rector of Shipham, Somersetshire.

Deane, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Kirtlington, Oxford; Rector of Lower Hardres, Canterbury.

Dunn, Rev. Thomas Major, M.A., Curate of Dewsall-with-Callow; Rector of Ruan Lanihorne, Cornwall.

Dyer, Rev. J. P., M.A., Chaplain, Dagshai, Punjab; Senior Chaplain on the Bengal (Rangoon) Establishment.

Evans, Rev. Canon Daniel Silvan, B.D., Rector of Llanwrin; Chancellor of Bangor Cathedral.

Gill, Rev. Ebenezer Ernest, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.

Gray, Rev. A. E. P., M.A., Rector of Wallasey; Rural Dean of Birkenhead.

Hammond, Rev. Frederick Anthony, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Handcock, Rev. Richard George, M.A.; Rector of Ditteridge, Wilts.

Harrison, Rev. Cyril Harling, B.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Hartley, Rev. Samuel, B.A., Vicar of Sawrey; Vicar of Crosby-on-Eden, Carlisle.

Hensley, Rev. E. J., M.A., Vicar of Chepstow; Chaplain of Chepstow Workhouse.

Hobart, Rev. W. H., M.A., Chaplain to St. Peter's Sisterhood, Kilburn; Vicar of Highbridge.

Hurrell, Rev. Swann, Incumbent of Brunswick Chapel; Vicar of Brenzett, Folkestone.

Hurst, Rev. Herbert Falkner, M.A., Rector of Allora, Queensland; Vicar of Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Jump, Rev. J. E., M.A., Vicar of Sturton-en-le-Steeple; Vicar of St. George's, Sheffield.

Kemble, Rev. Hulton Henry, B.A., Curate of Ambleside; Vicar of Low Wray, Lancashire.

Lowe, Rev. G. L. Gambier, B.A., Curate of Powderham; Rector of Throwleigh, Devonshire.

Lyttelton, Rev. the Hon. Edward, M.A., Head Master of Haileybury College; Honorary Canon of St. Albans Cathedral.

Nicholson, Rev. Harry, Curate of Masborough; Vicar of Kilham, Hull.

Pope, Rev. William Raymond, Curate; Rector of Godmanstone, Dorset.

Powell, Rev. Arthur H., M.A., LL.B., Vicar of St. John's, Waterloo road; Vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone.

Rogers, Rev. J. J. Warrington, M.A., Vicar of Bramfield Donative Rector of Blyford, Suffolk.

St. Aubyn, Rev. Ernest L., R.N.; Chaplain to the *Hawke*.

Smith, Rev. J. Francis, Supernumerary in the United Dioceses of Glasgow and Galloway; Rector of St. Luke's, Glasgow.

Soames, Rev. Gordon, M.A., Rector of Mildenhall, Wilts; Inspector of Church Schools for the Rural Deanery of Marlborough.

Srawley, Rev. J. H., B.A., Curate of St. Matthew's, Walsall Vice-Principal of Lichfield Theological College.

Townsend, Rev. Charles Henry; Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Truro.

Walker, Rev. R. E.; Resident Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.

Watson, Rev. William Sparrow, M.A., Head Master of Dorset County School, Dorchester; Vicar of Broadway, Somersetshire.

Williamson, Rev. G. C., Association Secretary to the Church Missionary Society for the South-West of England; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, Birmingham.

Wilson, Rev. H. T., B.A., Rector of Widford, Chelmsford; Honorary Secretary of the A.C.S. for Chelmsford Deanery.

Winslow, Rev. Charles de Blois, M.A., Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Blundell Sands; Rural Dean of Bootle.

Woodall, Rev. T. J., Vicar of Britford; Private Chaplain to the Earl of Radnor.

Young, Rev. John, M.A., Head Master of the Grammar-school, Swansea; Rector of South Hykeham, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blomfield, Rev. James Charles, M.A. Oxon, Hon. Canon of Christ Church and Rural Dean, for forty-five years Rector of the Parish, at Launton Rectory, Bicester, on the 7th inst., aged 74.

Cust, Ven. Edwards, late Canon of Ripon and Archdeacon of Richmond, Yorkshire, formerly Rector of Danby Wiske, at Danby Hill, Northallerton, on the 5th inst., aged 90.

Everett, Rev. Edward, at Manningford Abbotts, Wilts, on the 25th ult., aged 79.

Fitz-Gerald, Rev. Richard, for forty-five years Rector of the Parish, and of Coulanoule, Queen's County, Ireland, at Winslade Rectory, Basingstoke, on the 6th inst., aged 81.

Harrison, Rev. James Harwood, Rector, at Bugbrooke Rectory, on the 5th inst.

Rogers, Rev. Foster, M.A., for more than eighteen years Chaplain of the Hants County Prison, Winchester, and afterwards thirteen years Rector of Barrow, at 13, Kellett-road, Brixton, on the 8th inst., aged 88.

Shepherd, Rev. W. B., M.A., formerly Vicar of Higher Walton, near Preston, Lancashire, at Hartburn Vicarage, Northumberland, on the 3rd inst., aged 62.

Thompson, Rev. William, M.A., J.P., at Guldrey Lodge, Sedbergh, Yorkshire, on the 6th inst., aged 52.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VOICES OF THE UNIVERSE.

BY THE BISHOP OF RIPON.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH, BLOOMSBURY.

"There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification."—1 COR. xiv. 10

WE have in this verse the statement of the Apostle's view concerning what we may describe as the voices of the universe. He has a very profound conviction that in the multiplicity, and also the discord often, of the voices of the universe there is not lacking some distinct meaning. He declines the idea entirely that what he hears is a mere aggregation of meaningless noises. He says, "There are so many kinds of voices"; but he says, "I am persuaded that not one of them is defective, not one of them is lacking in signification." It is not true, indeed, that he meant that we could explain them, as, in fact, he distinctly shows that he declines the task of interpreting these various voices; but he is perfectly persuaded that, although these voices often sound enigmatic and discordant in his ears, that if he could only get the key to it, every single voice has its meaning. It is as if you stood in a foreign market-place, as many of us must have done, and heard the Babel of voices going on below. You are a stranger in the country, and you do not speak their language; but as you watch those eager faces entering into bargain one with another, greeting one another in the open sunshine, you feel that if only you had the key to the language, all these voices would have meaning for you. You may guess at the meaning of some few voices; you can see the faces all lit up with light and affection and kindly greeting one to another, and you may thus follow to a certain degree the sense of what they are saying; but as you listen to all the strange tumult of voices round about you, you say, "This carries no meaning to my ears, but I am not so foolish as therefore to say that it has no meaning." "There are many voices here, and I am certain not one of them is deficient in meaning." That is what the Apostle says, only he is speaking, not about the market-place, where human beings might assemble either for getting or bargaining, but he is speaking of all the voices of the great universe round about. He says, "I listen to them all, and I am persuaded that there is not one of them that has not got a distinct meaning."

Now, in that judgment of the Apostle, I think that the great majority of human beings will be ready, on the whole, to concur. All the voices of Nature have, at any rate, a charm for us. Unless we are ready to describe ourselves as entirely outside—so to speak—of nature, and sympathy with nature, we shall find that all of us will be ready to acknowledge the charm of Nature's voices. You cannot go out into the fields and listen to the murmur of the insect and the hum of the bee; to the song of the lark over your head, or even the gentle sighing of the wind beneath the trees—without feeling that these voices have a power to soothe, elevate, and to calm; and as you listen to them you admit their charm.

But, if you look, you will see that in the history of your own life, in all probability, there is a distinct tendency on your part to desire to pierce into the hidden meaning of these. When we were children, what effect had these voices upon us? How we delighted in them; how we clapped our hands at the song of the birds; how we loved to go down beside the merry brook and listen to its tinkle, and felt that there was music, as it were, spoken at our feet. How we loved to ramble by the sea-shore and, with half dread and half delight, to hear the voices as the great waves came tumbling in. But we were liable to other emotions also. When the lightning flashed and the thunder pealed we cowered to our mother's side; dread took possession of our hearts, and thus in our early life we had a sort of feeling that somehow or another these were voices that were speaking to us. We did not attempt, nor did we often give a conscious expression ourselves to the thought that they had a meaning; but the very delight of fascination which they had for us was an evident sign that we felt there was something in them. Oh, how splendid they grew to us, and how delighted we grew with them as life went on!

Then came the youth of life, that delicious pause, if only the young could make use of it, when somehow or another they stand upon that landing place where imagination wakes up. They have left behind them the unreasoning delights of childhood, and ask for the meaning and explanation of these things. Now they are assembled by the water-side, and the fingers of the youth will be put into the leaves of his favourite poem, when he wants some one to be a kind of master-interpreter to lead him into the midst of Nature and explain the purposes of its beautiful sounds. That is the stage of imagination. Here is a step, as it were, beyond the previous stage. Once you took a kind of unreasoning delight, but now you take a general interest, in the face of Nature; in other words, you are going a step forward towards the thought of the Apostle—that these things have some meaning. Nature has a power to wake up our young intelli-

gence, because it stimulates the questioning feeling; it stimulates us to ask the question, "What do these things mean?" We are not accustomed yet to the whole meaning of life, we have not yet got the strong mind, we have not yet got the well-disciplined reasoning faculties; but our imagination is quick and strong, and we say to Nature, "Disclose to me thy secrets, and what do these voices signify?"

And then, when we get into manhood, when we get the mastery over our reasoning powers, we feel still a strong desire to know the meaning of these things in Nature. Now, we are none the less earnest to discover its actual meaning. When a thing happens we do not pass it by with a childish dread, nor yet with a boyish imagination, attributing thoughts to it which are drawn out of the product of our own feelings, but we say, "What is the significance of this; why did that thing happen?" If we utilise our full reasoning faculties we may, in the spirit of intelligent inquiry, seek to discover what these voices mean. Therefore in the history of our intellectual growth there is a distinct indication that we are pushing on after the Apostle's thought; there is not one of these voices—that is the understood *premiss* of our efforts—there is not one of these voices that has not got a meaning.

And now mark; as is the history of the individual, so also is the history of the world. These voices broke upon the ears of men in early times, and they were in their childish age. How the untutored barbarian in the young life of nations trembled at the voice of thunder; how he attributed to every thing some God-like or Divine or mischievous power! He felt there was something in those voices which came to him and by which the gods had their power over him; and as he set up his little fetish, arranged his littie methods of worship, as he made his enchantment, he was but just like the child in the nursery, cowering to the side of that which he believes to be his protecting power. And yet what an instinct he has for the voice of Nature; what a wonderful power of forecasting what will happen! His eye is much quicker than yours, his ear is much more capable to catch distant sounds and to interpret them, and to point out in a moment things which you and I would pass by unrecognised. This is because Nature's voices are clear to him, even when they are not clear to us. But by-and-by, when men emerged from the childish condition, they wanted to know more, Then they gathered around the seer or king who might interpret these things to them, and they learned in a sense to bear them in their minds. Imagination is awake in the history of the world, and imagination takes these things—it takes Nature, poetry, and says, "I will explain it"; and then the poet or the prophet become the leaders of such a time, because they are the great interpreters of the voices of Nature round about. And that, again, only shows how true the world's verdict is in accordance with the Apostle's thought—that there is a significance in these, and that the earnest desire, not only of the individual, but of the race, is to wrest, as it were, from Nature the secret meaning of her deeds.

Then comes the later development—the manhood of human beings—and you know how true this is. Then come the other seers of nature. We are not now dealing with the singer, but we are dealing with the man of science, and the man of science is the interpreter of Nature. This is his function. The moment he abdicates that, he ceases to give anything which the world wants. We ask them, "Tell us the meaning of these things." The keen wit of man will penetrate into the secrets of Nature, asking when the voices speak, what do they mean; when he hears the thunder roar he will know the causes of the explosion; when the earthquake is beneath his feet he will make an investigation—"What is the meaning of this?" All the powers of the later life of mankind are directed still, though in different fashion, to an interpretation of the voices in the world. Now, these faculties, whether the childlsh, the imaginative, or the scientific power are, all of them, working as it were in the same direction, and they are expressing their belief that though there are so many kinds of voices in the world there is not one of them without signification.

But that does not mean for us, any more than it did for the Apostle, that there are not a large number of voices which are as yet uninterpreted. Much has been already explained, but much remains behind; much territory has been conquered, and Nature has revealed to us the significations of many of its voices; but still beyond all these, there are voices which humanity yet asks should be interpreted to it. Still the pale shadow of death waits behind, and we ask what the sepulchral voice of death means. Still we stand by the waves of the sea-shore, and we ask what these roarers mean by their voices. Still in the tumult of the tempest we want to have something explained. There still are the uninterpretable provinces of Nature; but we feel, as the Apostle felt, that though we may be able to pierce so far as to get some answer1 and some significations from Nature in some departments, so are we perfectly sure that if the key were given to us we should be able to find a significance in them all. We, too, stand as it were upon the great market-place of the world once more. We hear the babble of the voices in this great market of the universe, wherein all the forces of Nature are exchanging their strange merchandise, and are turning heat and light into force and motion. Still are the voices round about us like the clamour of the market-place, and we say, "We have not the key to them all." Some we dimly gaze at; some voices have a meaning to us; but

there are so many kinds of voices, and we are persuaded, though some of them are as yet enigmatical to us, yet if only we could get the key, not one of them is without signification. Such is the Apostle's thought, and so far, I think, you will agree that the general tendency of humanity is to agree with the Apostle.

But now I want you to see that the Apostle wants to go further than that. He was not here to teach us a lesson on what we may call natural philosophy, or the explanation of the phenomena of Nature. He was not simply dealing as a poet might, who takes us down to the river's margin and tells us that the very stream at our feet has a meaning; but rather he is writing to men and women, and he is anxious to arrest men by the thought of this great truth that there is not a voice which sounds in Nature which is without its signification.

For what follows? This is but dumb Nature. This nature around us, compared with the voice of man, is after all only a dumb thing. There are no articulate voices around us in Nature; these are but the inarticulate cries of what we call either the animate or the inanimate creation. There rise beyond these men, men with reason, men with power to articulate speech, men capable therefore of expressing the thoughts that are in their hearts, men whose voices are capable not only of a doubtful but of a real signification. Now the Corinthian Churches were all ambitious of great gifts; they delighted to be prominent among the Churches in the possession of various gifts, miracles, prophecies, tongues, what not! and he is most anxious to bring them back to the sober realisation of the significance of things, and to draw them away from the vulgar ambition and the mere display of them. The difference between man and man, he says, lies here—that a man may be ambitious of using his gifts, but after all the using of the gift implies that the gift has some use, and the gift must be used in such a sense as that it conveys a definite idea to man. He says, if you have the gift of prophecy, if you have the gift of tongues, pray that you may interpret them. I want you to be certain of this—that what you utter is something that your brother man can understand. There, he said, I would rather speak five words in the church that would be understood than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. Better, he says, a word of kindly greeting between man and man, than all the most eloquent gibberish under heaven, because this does no good. There are many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification. Nature rolls the thunder over our head; Nature spreads the water beneath our feet, and none of them are without meaning; but, O man! created with a power greater, and an intelligence nobler, than is lodged in the thunder-cloud or in the ocean, remember this—if you believe that these inarticulate voices have signification, know that it is your highest privilege to take of your life and to make it bear true signification and real meaning amongst your brother men. That is what he urges, and therefore he says, "I care not what your gift may be—speech, miracle, power of doing great things, or the power of speaking great things; take care that all these gifts may be brought under the subordination of the intelligence you possess; for the value of a gift lies not in its astonishing men, not in its coercing their admiration, but in its benefiting their lives, in its profiting their understandings. Therefore, he says, remember it is a base thing—almost an ignoble thing, for a being who belongs to the higher order of creation to be speaking, and speaking into the ear, and that those who listen should not then be able to say at the close of your giving of thanks, "Amen." For all human effort ought to awake the loud "Amen" of a true responsive intelligence; and every effort of ours is a lost effort, every exertion of ours is a wasted exertion, if it does not bring forth a strong "Amen" from some human heart.

What follows? Is it not true that just as there are so many kinds of voices in Nature which, indeed, may have a meaning, but which meaning I cannot understand, so also is it with regard to poor human life. There are lives that are meaningless to us, and there are lives that are full of meaning. What is this life? Oh, how gay and pleasant he is, so full of all that ready *bonhomie*, to meet you with such grace and kindliness! And as you watch him you say, "There is a career before that young man; he has such grace and such readiness of manner; he, by his very graciousness of disposition, paves the way to success, and his friendliness of manner makes every one his friend." He is invited out to many a drawing-room, he is just the one that is sought after; give him a place there, for he is always pleasant! But what has come of his life? Read it! At threescore years and ten he is the old dandy of the drawing-room still, and he dandles his eye-glass in the old fashion of his youthful days, and people bear with him with a quiet smile of patient derision, and say, "What has he done? He is a very nice fellow, but no more." There are many kinds of voices in human life, but are there not some of them that are contemptibly insignificant, directed to no purpose—the flotsam and jetsam of life, mere driftwood on the great ocean of life, welcomed here and there, doing nothing, achieving nothing? That is the kind of life.

There are lives, but you need not go into the gay drawing-rooms to find them. You may find them in more prosaic places still. Yes; he got such a good appointment when he was young, and he was looked to as one who was certain to rise. Had he not such a good address and way with him? Business would follow such a young man as that! But somehow or another you watch the

other clerks in the office, and one by one they push by him, because his heart never was in the business. The moment the clock struck and the door of the office was closed, away he was on anything except his business. And there he is in the City still, lean, cadaverous, starved—leading a pointless existence, and you say what a shame that he should be left to be in a subordinate position at such an age! No, no, but wait a moment. Had his life been capable of expressing itself in any articulate form, he had not been there; but he is one of the inarticulate beings, and therefore he remains where he is. If he had only shown purpose, and if he had only spoken out in an intelligible voice, men would have listened, and he would have been a man amongst men; and now what is he? He is merely a thing; he is an appendage of the institution or the office of which he is a member.

Why, yes, there are such things, alas as useless lives, insignificant lives. Yes, how happy you can be; how joyous, because upon you there come no cares. It is for men to go out into the world and toil, but you in your girlhood feel, "I have no such sense of responsibility as this, thank God, and can just enjoy myself!" And so enjoyment is followed by this—the slow deterioration of all the powers There is no study, and the intellect has grown barren. There is no exertion for the sake of others, and the heart gradually becomes selfish, enclosed. There is no effort of will against the mere love of pleasure, and so the character never achieves its own dignified self-possession. Or you may marry, and you may bear children; but even in your motherhood, your life will be a mere insignificant thing, for over the cradle the listlessness of your pleasure-loving disposition will be there, and you will not transmit, either by blood or example, to your offspring a nobler conception of life, as that a human being should not be sent into the world and pass from it without speaking some articulate message to his fellows.

And if there are these inarticulate lives, remember there are lives that speak out with strong and clear meaning. St. Paul says, "I had rather speak five words with my own understanding than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." Watch him, the old Sage of the past, going through the streets of Athens! See how he pauses before man after man! See how his words are few, but his questions are searching! See how he probes into the interior of their understanding, and makes the man undisclose the true basis of his thought. See how he makes the man question himself by being the suggestor of keen and powerful questions. Why, this man who speaks but little, who leaves nothing of his own on record, has yet a voice; and Socrates spelt out to the world at any rate some word, and that word was "Truth." In this life there are some men, and their lives are only like letters scattered down by an infant hand, spelling out nothing. Other lives spell out something as Socrates spelt "Truth."

And again; why, see those lives of which I speak, the inarticulate lives, only like the notes of the piano struck by some infant hand, without cohesion, harmony, beauty, or expression—only an annoyance to those who have a sense of music at all. How different with some of the voices that come and speak to us, majestic as the anthems of the sea—a voice like Milton's, strong in song, strong also to be on the side of what he believed to be the true; capable also of holding to his principles and rebuking even his own adherents when he felt that they had gone beyond true principal. "Thou hadst a voice"—that will be the eulogy of such a man as that—"a voice majestic like the sea;" not a voice that spoke only in his sonorous prose, or in his magnificent verse, but in the dignity and coherence of his life there was the majesty of his voice! These men spelt out something—some song that sang for humanity.

And then there are others whom we look to—those who sound the trumpet for us in this great war. Do not think it is an ignoble conception! Life is a warfare for the most of us, and the man is wise who says, "While I am in this world I stand at arms watching, for who knows when the foe may come!" Such a man's conscience and will and intelligence are always listening to hear if there be any note which sounds an alarm; ready to gird on his armour, ready to confront the foe! Yet, alas! what strange sounds are these, the doubtful, hesitating notes blown from the trumpet which seems to be placed to the lips of one who has as yet no conception of what the order is that he has to give. Others there are who take the trumpet from the hands of men and blow a blast, and the world rises up and says, "It is a call to war. What are we to do? Show us, and we follow!" And here to-day you and I know, speaking on this which is the memorial Sabbath of one great name amongst us, that just so was his voice the trumpet voice of God into our ears. Take him as you please, this was the significance of his life, its great coherence; its power of speaking out one thing, that men might feel that at least there was one amongst them to whom God was King and to whom life was duty.

But if, then, we find these varieties of voices, notes which stir us up, lives which somehow have no influence over us, and other lives which, like martial music, rouse all our noble ardours and make us ready to take the field—what is the secret which makes the difference? What is the cause which makes one life so full to us, while another has no meaning? What is it that constitutes the articulateness or the inarticulateness, the significance or the insignificance, of human lives? One very simple thing—coherence, that is all. The reason why these letters spell something is because they cohere together according to a

certain law, and express something. The reason why these notes are sweet and inspiring to your ear is because they blend together according to the codes of harmony. And so are human lives bound together by something which brings coherence and signification, harmony and force. And, if you recollect, that is just exactly what happens. Look at the lives which strike us; look at the imperious and imperial personalities amongst us. See the great man so much before us during the last few days. What makes Bismarck such as he is? Coherence—one purpose! Criticise as you please, there can be no question of the greatness which testifies, "I have a purpose; I will weld the empire into one, and I will make Germany great. Everything shall be diverted to that end." That is coherence. The difference between a life which is full of meaning and a life which is insignificant lies precisely in the word "coherence." Why was Newton great? Why, because Newton, like all great men, said, "This one thing I do," and he forgot his food in the earnest contemplation and pursuit of science. It is coherence which makes greatness in life.

"Ah," but you say, "that is exactly what we know. It is well to talk of these things and to give us these great names, but what of us? We have not gifts like these; we are not Newtons nor Bismarcks; we cannot climb to the heights of science, nor can we dive into the deep places of politics." Ah, but pardon me, are we not forgetting the Apostle's principle? It is not ten thousand words of an incoherent life which make a grand and eloquent passage in the history of a nation, but it is even but five words which are coherent, and therefore are greater than the ten thousand words in an unknown and, therefore, an unsignifying tongue. And so the Apostle gives us the key to it all. Your life and mine; why, I care not in what circumstances they may be placed—that is not the question. Coherence does not depend upon the number of letters which are given to you, but upon your power to blend them into something significant. It is not the whole alphabet which is given to every one of which to make some noble verse. No; you are given your few letters, and the skill of your life is that it shall express something, and something sweet, and so your notes shall be manifold. Maybe the instrument which is put into your hand is only one; you are not given, perhaps, to preside over the orchestra of the world, and to send forth the majestic sounds of some great oratorio-like life; but you are given an exercise, with some few notes, and it is for you to work it out so that the exercise shall be sweet and significant. Make your lives coherent, and your lives will be great. Let your lives be incoherent, and with no power to interest in them, with no working out of any solitary single purpose, and then as they are incoherent, so are they insignificant; and for human beings, possessed of will and thought, to be insignificant in life is to be contemptible also.

What is the key the Apostle gives us? Why, it is at the very head of the chapter. He starts the chapter by saying, "Follow after charity." There is the key of the coherence of any life, however small or however great. Oh, it is not your power of prophecy, you great men of genius! it is not your power of wonder-working, you man of action in the midst of this world! it is not your power of startling people into admiration by reason of your strong gifts! These are not the things, for yonder in God's heaven it is God's to listen, not for those strange voices which provoke human admiration, but for the simple voices that express in simple lives one single thought of love. If you will only take the passion of love and "follow after charity" and bring that in as the measuring force, the guiding force, the instilling power of your life, whatever else you may fail to do, you will not fail of making your life a truly significant one. I do not mean that the world will hear of you—do not mistake me—but what I do mean is, that where you have been, and what you have done amongst the few to whom God sent you, will not have been insignificant.

Ah, "follow after charity." Who may gather its power! The simplest things are the strongest; the most commonplace things are the greatest after all. The bonds of your home lie not in the greatness of the calling of the man who goes forth to business, but they lie in the simple affection which is lodged there—in the home love. The simplest things, the commonplace things, are the mighty things of life. "Follow after charity;" cultivate it, make your lives under the guidance of that fertile love. Spell out day by day the five words of the meekness, the gentleness, the purity, the righteousness, the love of Christ, and you will bring into your life that which, at the close, will make it not an unworthy one—an inarticulate life, but a life which has God's meaning in it.

And then you will say, "Yes; whence this power? The commonplace is often the most unattainable" True; but there was One Life that was very short for ministerial purposes—but three and a-half short years, and yet that life spelt out to human kind God's love and whatever else men have forgotten, they never will, since that life has been lived, forget that love has triumphed where all other powers have failed. And that life which, remember, is the guardian life of the Christian Church; that life which is the exemplar life of every Christian man and woman; that life which also can be yours because His Spirit that shed abroad the Divine will be an inspiring life to you—is a life accessible to all men. And the revelation and the inspiration which is in Christ is surely linked up there in the thought, Follow, follow after charity. Pursue it as if it were the one thing you wanted. Take it to your bosoms

until that love which He showed is a love which is attributed also to you. Sun yourself in the sunshine of that love till your heart grows warm, and you, too, will go out with such sunshine in your hearts, such power in your lives, that it will be impossible for you ever to live an insignificant life; for all men will take knowledge of you, that you are the epistles, living epistles, known and read of all men, because you carry the message of God's undying love throughout the world.

There are many kinds of voices, and so I would ask you at each occasion of your life to deal with your life so as to give it signification. If I might venture the application to-night, I would say remember on each occasion and stage of your life you can give it either significance or insignificance. The significance of your worship here to-night is this one thing, the expression of the reality of your thought, the reality of your purpose, the reality of your sympathy. To go out of God's House and church, and carry with you no sense of the reality of love, is to have missed, so to speak, the signification of our worship. As we lift up our hearts to Him, oh! believe it, His dowry of love comes down to us. Nay, if we would only lift up our eyes, we should find that love enfolds us everywhere. And if this worship becomes significant to you, remember that the outpouring of your sympathetic love will be the readiness to co-operate in every good work, such as that for which your alms are asked to-night. Do not let, in your generosity, your worship be an insignificant thing —that you have joined in prayer and praise and accepted the ministries of this church, and yet feel no sympathy with its toilers and labourers who have their difficulties to meet. Remember, that if you yourself follow after charity, the heart, warmed into consciousness of that will go out to the world, out to-day in its streets, and out to-morrow and through your life with a message which never will be stayed, because it will be one of the voices of God which cannot be without signification.

CHRIST AND SIN.

By the Rev. W. LOCK, M.A., Tutor of Keble College, Oxford.

Sermon Preached in the Chapel of Keble College.

"Go and sin no more."—St. John viii. 11.

IT is an admitted fact that one of the chief characteristics of our generation is the increased tendency to specialisation, both in departments of study and in spheres of work. It is a tendency for good no less than for evil. It produces within its range of study or of work a marvellous accuracy, a striking mastery of detail, a penetrating insight into the exact lie of a question, an almost prophetic power of anticipating the quarter from which new light will arise. All this makes for good, but equally obvious are the dangers of isolation of sympathy, of disproportion of view, of a want of sanity of judgment. The tendency, therefore, needs control, and there are two bodies whose influence is constantly being put forth to control it—the University and the Church.

The University utters its protest on behalf of a wider range of knowledge; the Church on behalf of life. The University protests against a premature specialisation. You will do right, it seems to say, to concentrate your attention on some one special branch of study, but you must first know enough of other lines to enable you to see the proportion which your subject bears to the whole range of knowledge, so that you may never forget that you are dealing only with one fragment of an enormous and manifold whole. On the other hand, the Church puts in its protest on behalf of spiritual life, of the emotions, of the will. You may specialise with your intellect, it seems to say, but you may never at any time treat the intellect as though it were your whole nature; in your devotion to study you cannot afford to neglect to be human, to ignore the tenderness of society and of affection; you cannot afford to neglect the sense of dependence upon God and of reverence which worship only can give. You may have to cast overboard this interest and that recreation, but it is at your peril, at your very serious peril, that prayer and worship are surrendered under the pressure of the storm. "Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved."

Now Lent narrows down this Church protest into one particular form; it claims that the thought of sin shall not be crowded out of our lives; it insists that no estimate of life can be adequate which ignores this factor, that it will be our wisdom, early in life and without delay, to take the measure of this enemy "which lieth at the door," and to reckon seriously with it. We will try, then, to listen to this protest to-day, with the hope that with God's grace this Lent may teach us more about sin. As we do so, it is clear that two different paths may lead us to the same goal. One path is that of self-examination; that is a necessary path, but one which each must pursue alone. If we follow that path, the result will be that by Holy Week we shall know better where our enemy gains entrance into our hearts, and how best we may hope to deal with him. But to-day I will ask you to follow another path, and to consider what our Lord's teaching is about sin. The result which we may hope to attain by that path is that, when Holy Week comes, we may be able to see it more exactly as He did, to feel towards it, in our measure, with something of His sensitiveness.

Even when the subject is thus narrowed down, it is too vast; it must be sufficient to single out three different truths.

(A) Our Lord extends the range of sin. He sees

its presence lurking where it had been unsuspected before; He tracks it further and further until He has reached its home.

The natural instinct of man is to narrow its range. Society picks out a few clearly marked, unmistakable acts of sin; it labels them with the special name of immorality and corruption; we manage to keep free of these, or at least free of detection in them, and our conscience readily lulls itself to sleep; we are not "as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers." How different is the Lord's judgment! Extortion, injustice, adultery—these play a very slight part in his denunciations of sin; indeed, it needed not a special revelation to reveal their character. But His eye passes deeper still; the first movement of anger in the heart, the look of lust, the word of scorn, these have already the mark of sin upon them. The Sermon on the Mount thus tracks sin home into the heart; but the parables carry the quest further. Think of the chief grounds of condemnation in the Lord's severest judgments. There is Dives in torments—why? Because he did nothing when Lazarus was at his gates. The servant with one talent is cast out into outer darkness—why? Becaure he did nothing with his talent, and so was slothful and unprofitable. The uncharitable heathen go away into everlasting punishment—why? Because they did nothing; they did not obey the simple instincts of humanity. The man without a wedding garment is bound hand and foot—why? Because, though coming to a king's wedding, he made no preparation. Here, then, sin is tracked further back to the sluggish, selfish will, which refuses to stir itself for God or man. When the Lord laid down the two great commandments as the love of God and the love of our neighbour, then failure to love God and to love man became the two great sins of man. When He added, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent," failure to believe on Him—the timid, selfish want of self-committal, the self-satisfied limitation to the things of sight—this, too, was stamped with the mark of sin. You see, then, how shallow is the idea that, because Christ broke down some human traditions, therefore He relaxed the demands of morality upon man, or thought sin less serious than it had been thought under the Mosaic law. "I say unto you" always marks a greater demand upon man than "it was said by them of old time," and therefore it marks a deeper revelation of the character of sin.

(B) But, in spite of this, our Lord is always hopeful in the face of sin. He never despairs of its conquest. While He traces up sin to the perversion of man's will, He never implies that it is rooted in man's nature, that sin is natural because the flesh is essentially sinful. Such a view must have presented itself to any thinker at that time; it was the common view among Eastern religions. It very early tried to force its way into Christianity in Gnosticism; but our Lord's language is quite free from it. It has been well said that "in proportion as the moral consciousness is keen and active, men know that sin is not nature, but its violation; that they are not what they are meant to be in sinning," and that is the attitude which the Lord always adopts to sin. This is true not only of that which seems to lie so far above us, His own instantaneous refusal to listen to temptation, but equally so in His speech about ordinary men; though He knows what is in man, and therefore will not commit Himself unto them, while their wills are yet unregenerate, yet when the Apostles have given up their wills to His guidance, He does commit Himself, His truth, and His Church, entirely to them. He never loses faith in any who come to Him; the offending limb can be cut off and the man saved; the palsied limb can be cured; the sin can be forgiven. "Son, thy sins are forgiven thee." The will can be strengthened—"Go and sin no more." These are not on His lips the words of empty mockery, but the prophecy of a real recovery.

(C) Thirdly, the Lord willingly endures in His own person the consequences of sin. The whole lesson of His life's work is that the thing most worth taking effort for is the driving out of this unnatural force which is ruining man's nature. He enters into sympathy with a sinful race; He sees that sinful creatures owe to God amends and expiation for their sins, and so He makes amends and expiation; He gives His life for the remission of sins. He finds men with disordered wills bent on selfish aims, and He lives among them the pattern of perfect obedience, by His example and by His authority drawing back their wills into the happiness of obedience. But such an action necessarily implies pain. "Self-sacrifice, painful and disheartening labour on the part of the innocent, appears to be the irrevocable condition of every effective endeavour to rescue men from the just results of their folly, their indolence, and their vice. The brightest pages in the history of our race are precisely those which are covered with the story of suffering and of exhausting labour, voluntarily undertaken and endured by the noble for the base, by the righteous for the unrighteous, by the innocent for the guilty!" * And the Lord could be no exception to this law; the miracles are an effort to Him, and He is conscious of the power that goes forth from Himself to heal; it is pain to Him to be in the presence of hypocrisy, of hardening hearts, of faithless demands for external signs; He groans in spirit at the sight of death. Yet He perseveres, and bears all, even the agony in the Garden, and the sense of desertion upon the Cross. So the Atonement is a free act of love: "No man taketh My life from Me, but I lay it down of Myself"; and the thought of any possible injustice in the Atonement passes away before the thought of love.

* R. W. Dale, "Christian Doctrine," p. 250.

Only if it is unjust for a soldier to sacrifice his life for his country, for a doctor to wear himself out for his patients, for a parent for his child, or a child for his parent, only then can the Atonement be treated as unjust. In each case the voluntary self-sacrifice is a proof of the value of those for whom it is made, and of the serious danger of the enemy from whom they are saved.

In all of these three thoughts about sin, our Lord should be a guide to our own estimate of its nature. For us it is important that we should not limit sin to a few acts which we may perhaps be able to avoid; and if we have been guilty of clear acts of sin, that we should remember that the evil lies behind the act, in the dallying with the thoughts of evil, or the want of a true sense of duty, which led to the first weakening of the will, and that the only lasting remedy lies in strengthening the will by union with His will. For us, too, it is important that we should be quite clear that no sin can be excused as natural, that circumstances are never the final explanation of our sins, but that in the end there has been an act of weakness and of treachery on our part, letting the foe within the gates. It has to be driven out, and driven out as an enemy. In a quaint American phrase, "When you say good-bye to your sin, it is not wise to stop to shake hands with it." Yes, and even the third truth has its bearing upon our lives, only, of course, it touches us at a different point. Our Lord had only to face the consequences of the sins of others: we have to face the consequences of our own. No act of ours can make complete atonement for our sin, but we shall try to make what amends lie in our power both to God and man; we shall try to bear willingly the consequences of past sin, not to rebel, not to murmur, not to let them fall upon the innocent. "Christ," it has been strikingly said, "bore what we could not bear that we might bear it after Him." Hence "we do for gratitude what He did for love" (Vinet). Once more, "the proof of sorrow for sin is willingness to suffer. . . . . Can we, if we realise at all what sin is, in itself and in its consequences, be content merely with our own pardon and not endeavour, as well on our own account as on that of others, to make some amends to God for all that He has suffered from at our hands? Worthless and poor our attempt may be, but surely more worthless is the spirit which would dispense with them."* These are the words of no priest, but of a true-hearted Christian layman, and they ring true and manly. This is the manly facing of the fact of our own sins, that we should try to make all the amends that lie in our power; and as we try to do this, as we find how hard a task it is to undo any sin, however slight we shall realise more what it cost our Lord to redeem us, we shall understand the lesson of Holy Week, and it may be that it will be given to us to help to bear the consequences of the sins of others, and to encourage them to sin no more.

* Viscount Halifax, "The Lord's Day and the Eucharist," p. 5.

THE Rev. the Hon. A. T. Lyttelton has been elected a proctor to represent the archdeaconry of Manchester in the Lower House of York Convocation.

AT a meeting of the beneficed clergy of the archdeaconry of Man, held at St. George's Church, Douglas, Isle of Man, on Wednesday, the 12th inst., the Rev. B. P. Clarke, B.A., vicar of Marown, was elected proctor for the Convocation of York, to fill the vacancy caused by the promotion of the Rev. H. S. Gill to the Archdeaconry.

THE seventeenth annual ecclesiastical and educational art exhibition in connection with the Church Congress will be held in St. Giles's-hall, Norwich, which is conveniently situated with regard to the congress halls and the cathedral, and will be open from October 7th till the 11th. Promises of support in the general trade section have been received from all the leading church and school furnishers, and the clergy and Churchmen generally are being invited to contribute towards the loan collection, which promises to be of more than usual interest. The Church societies, who have found by experience that the exhibition forms a splendid *rendezvous* for their friends and supporters, will again muster in force. The exhibits will include articles of every description used in the services of the Church, besides fittings and stained-glass windows. Space will also be reserved for religious literature, educational works and appliances, etc. Offers of loans of old plate, embroidery, wood and ivory carvings, paintings, old MSS. and books, and articles of archæological interest, should be addressed to the manager, Mr. John Hart, Maltravers House, 17 and 18, Arundel Street, Strand.

TWO inaugural lectures and the Rede Lecture at Cambridge fell in the same week, and all attracted large audiences. Professor Waldstein discoursed in his own fluent style on those who make art, those who enjoy art, and those who understand it. Lord Acton's lecture made a profound impression; it was full of weighty matter, and was enlivened by a profusion of epigram. As a sketch of the rise of modern history and of the present opportunitities for pursuing the study, it was most striking; while there was an added personal interest in pronouncements about impartiality and strictness of moral judgment which showed the line which the Professor intends to take; it may be enough to say that some of his co-religionists can hardly be expected to be altogether satisfied with his attitude. The Bishop of Peterborough was particularly happy as Rede Lecturer in the way in which he dealt with a question that perennially burns; his subject was the influence of the renascence on England, and it led him to speak of the action of the two Universities respectively in the sixteenth century in language which would not be altogether inapposite in the present day. He had much that was quaint to say of forgotten humanists, and his remarks on the persistence of English character as shown in the English attitude towards learning were very interesting.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1895.

CROMWELL.

ON the anniversary of Naseby Field, the House of Commons has occupied itself with discussing the pros and cons for commemorating the Lord Protector. We do not grudge Oliver his statue, "warts and all," as he could have liked it. Neither do we think he is likely to get it after the close vote in the Commons. But the debate has certainly added one barb the more to the shafts of ridicule, which are killing the Government. And there is a certain fitness in this. For, if we may speculate at all on what might be done now by a man who died two and a half-centuries ago, we should imagine that Oliver Cromwell would have made short work of our present pseudo-governors. He is helping to do it. Whatever his faults—and no doubt they were many—Oliver Cromwell was a great Englishman, who made his country respected and feared all the world over. He was a type of determination and resolute self-confidence, shrewd and diplomatic and not ready to invite opposition, but at the same time not afraid of it, and in the habit of making up his own mind, and sticking to it. He was a model of those very qualities which are conspicuously absent in the incompetent and shallow opportunists, who now propose to erect a statue to his memory, and invite a damaging comparison between their weakness and his strength. And the contrast between the man of the Commonwealth and this Government which pretends to delight to honour him, is not more marked in the men themselves than in the measures with which they are identified. To compare the policy of the Lord Protector with the policy of the present Administration is to compare light with darkness. The student of history smiles at the notion of Cromwell being claimed as patron of the modern Radical, the little Englander, and, best of all, the Home Ruler. Cromwell! The man of coercion and resolute government, who had a very short way with all those who disagreed with him—Lords or Commons, patriots or Puritans. The man who probably had less faith in the infallibility of Parliament than any English statesman before or since, and who took absolutely no pains to conceal the fact, but treated the House of Commons, when it lapsed into its usual tendency to twaddle and interfere, with less ceremony than he could have treated so many lackeys.

A little consideration of some of Cromwell's proceedings may be instructive and interesting, especially to his Radical admirers. Omitting his very pronounced views on the Irish Question, and especially on Home Rule, it may be noted—

1. That he abolished the House of Lords; he did not content himself with the safer course of revolution by resolution.

2. But within a short space he set up the House of Lords again—a precedent which has probably been overlooked by the valiant promoters of the crusade against the Lords in these days.

3. That he disestablished the Church.

4. But established in a most thorough fashion the rule of the Dissenting preacher in manners and morals, as well as religion.

5. That he did not disendow religion.

6. That he showed his respect for the supreme wisdom and authority of Parliament in these impressive ways.

In 1648 the majority of Parliament having voted against him, he dismissed the majority and retained the minority who voted on his side ("Pride's Purge").

In 1653 he expelled the entire Parliament, and elected a new one by means of his Council of State and the Independent ministers. This was Establishment with a vengeance. Eight months after Comwell dispensed with this Parliament, and governed without one until a more convenient season.

In 1654 a new Parliament was formed, from which Cromwell excluded no less than 100 members who would not promise him their support.

This Parliament existed for five months, and was then dismissed, and Cromwell governed without a Parliament for upwards of two years. In the interval he divided the country into eleven military districts, controlled and administered by his generals.

In 1656 a new Parliament was graciously allowed to meet, less 90 members excluded; in the next year it was dissolved.

In January, 1658, another Parliament met; it was dissolved at the end of the same month, and England knew Parliament no more until the Lord Protector was dead and buried.

From this it will be seen that the solitary item of the Newcastle Programme upon which Cromwell would not have put his foot is that of short Parliaments. And even then he had his own peculiar way of shortening them. The parliamentary record of this establisher of religion and reviver of the House of Lords is something like this: During his period of power he summoned and dismissed no less than five Parliaments, not one of which ever met intact, or sat more than a few months, or was anythlng more than an instrument in its master's hands, constituted as he chose, and conducted as he directed. He governed practically without a Parliament, and died without one. "Take away that bauble" fitly describes his parliamentary attitude. It is not for us to say he was wrong. But it is certainly like building the tombs of the prophets to find the worshippers of the jumping cat, the promoters of Home Rule all round, and the supporters of Government by the odd vote, raising the statue of the man who would have begun by purging the country of them and all their works.

CHURCH NOTES.

It is with much regret we notice that the Additional Curates Society has again to report declining funds. At the annual meeting this week, a deficit of £4,200 was reported in addition to a previous deficit of £10,500. This fact, as the *Church Times* observes, represents either a cooling down of enthusiasm or some fault in the management. It does almost seem as if modern Churchmen will only heartily support societies which flaunt a party badge, though the S.P.C.K. is a conspicuous example to the contrary.

What is certain is that there is no unwillingness on the part of the younger clergy to work in the poor and crowded districts for whose benefit the society chiefly exists. Mr. Winnington-Ingram, the well-known head of the Oxford Mission, in his speech at the meeting, said:—"It is the pick of the universities—the captains of the boats and men who are the life of the universities—who want to come into East London and work." He pledged himself on their behalf to provide 2,000 men, if only the most modest remuneration were secured for them. "They only ask food and lodging, and if you will give them that, they will come and work for you."

The reading or singing of the Athanasian Creed in the morning service on two consecutive Sundays, Whitsun Day and Trinity Sunday, is pretty sure to revive for a little while the almost extinct agitation for its disuse. A clergyman writes that recently a working man, who is a member of his choir, spoke to him about the creed, and on his explaining that many of its difficulties are the result of mistranslation, he exclaimed, "Then why isn't it altered?" The clergyman seems to be in equal perplexity on this point. He can only echo the question, "Why is it not altered?" We have a Revised Bible, why not a revised Athanasian Creed, seeing that the need is so great?

There are, we suppose, difficulties in the way of an authorised new translation, but the greatest difficulties of the "triumphant war song of the Church," as Newman called it, are not to be got over by more accurate translation. Those who argue for verbal amendment have, however, something to say for themselves. It is not long since a writer in a weekly paper which is regarded as the organ of cultured Churchmen spoke of the term "incomprehensible" in the creed as if it meant unintelligible. That that is the view of average Church-goers there is little doubt. But why do not the clergy take the opportunity, on one of the days when the creed is used, to explain this and other difficulties which puzzle the untaught worshipper?

The Rochester Diocesan Conference has passed a resolution in favour of Lord Halifax's Bill providing for the relief of clergymen from the obligation to lend their churches for the re-marriage of divorced persons. The resolution was adopted at the suggestion of the President as an amendment to a more thoroughgoing proposal. By this the Conference was asked to declare that the re-marriage of divorced persons during the lifetime of either party is contrary to the law of God and of the Church of England, and that such marriages having been legalised by the State, they should take place in a registrar's office, their solemnisation in church being an encouragement to sin and a desecration of the house of God.

There seems to be a popular notion that the objection to the re-marriage of divorced persons in church is confined to High Churchmen. That this is not so there is abundant evidence, but the remarks of the Bishop of Sodor and Man at his Diocesan Convocation are worth quoting, because Dr. Straton is, if we except the Bishop of Liverpool, about the most pronounced Low Churchman on the bench. He said that, had his attention been drawn to the subject in time, he should have been glad to introduce a clause with regard to the marriage of the guilty party to a divorce suit in any Manx church. His clear conviction was that the use of any Manx church should be absolutely forbidden for such a marriage.

What the clergy generally think on the subject is shown by such a fact as this:—A letter to the Bishop of Oxford has been signed by every incumbent in the two rural deaneries of Oxford and Reading, asking him to use his influence in the House of Lords and elsewhere to relieve the beneficed clergy from the grievance of being required by law to lend their churches for the re-marriage of divorced persons.

Considering that the Church in Wales is supposed to be doomed, it is remarkable how many Dissenters are hastening to join it. Two ex-Baptist ministers, the Rev. John Russell and the Rev. Mortimer Morris, were formally received into communion with the Church the other day by the Bishop of Llandaff at a special service in the Palace Chapel. It is not stated whether they are going to receive Holy Orders.

We gave recently some examples of the miserable failure of the so-called Voluntary System in America. But we need not cross the ocean for proof. It may be found in London and in every large town. The *Islington Gazette* reports that the River-street Independent Chapel in that parish is in serious difficulty. The minister, whose salary is not forthcoming, has had to resign, and the congregation has dwindled down to a mere handful

The chief cause of this state of things is stated to be "the migration of the more wealthy members to the suburbs." The local paper adds that the River-street Chapel is not the only instance of the kind, "for there is hardly a Nonconformist church in Islington that does not complain bitterly of the same thing." Of course, and the same thing would happen to the parish churches if the Church were disendowed.

One of Dean Farrar's sons, the Rev. Eric M. Farrar, M.A., vicar of St. Thomas's, Coventry, has been offered the important suburban living of Aigburth, Liverpool. It is stated that Mr. Farrar thinks it too soon to move from his present parish, to which he was appointed only in 1893, but the Aigburth trustees are pressing him to go to Liverpool.

The Rev. H. Lindsay Young, vicar of St. John's, Portsmouth, is not going to the English Episcopal Church at Edinburgh to which he had been invited. The *English Churchman* announces that he has declined the offer.

The Rev. Eric Lewis, who went out with the Church Missionary Society's Soudan party in 1890, has, we learn from the *Record*, joined the "Disciples of Christ." The "Disciples of Christ," our contemporary informs us, are an American body founded in 1809, and claiming to seek a return to the belief and practice of the Primitive Church. They now number some 800,000 members, with universities, schools, religious papers, and an organisation for foreign missions at work in England, Scandinavia, Turkey, India, China and Japan.

Last Monday there was to be a confirmation at Christ Church, Hampstead. The candidates were numerous and their friends expectant, but there was no bishop. Some hymns were sung, and in the course of an hour's wating addresses were given by the Rev. G. F. Head and Canon Girdlestone, and then the assemblage was dismissed. Considerable annoyance was felt by parents and friends who had come away from other duties, one having travelled as much as sixty miles to be present. No reason for the Bishop's failure was given at the time, but possibly as the *Record* suggests, it was a case of "overcrowding."

Perhaps not. A similar disappointment occurred some few years ago at a church in another part of London. On that occasion the Bishop was considerably rated for his carelessness. Dr. Temple never replied, or allowed anybody to explain on his behalf, but it oozed out that the carelessness was that of a subordinate, and the Bishop preferred to take the blame on himself to incriminating any one else.

The English Churchmen in Paris, now a numerous body, are to have a Church House of their own. A meeting was lately held at the British Embassy to consult as to the best means of raising funds for the object, and it was decided that there was no better way than a sale of work. The meeting was much gratified by an announcement made by Lady Dufferin that the Embassy might be used for the purpose. Dr. Noyes, the chaplain to the Embassy, thanked Lord and Lady Dufferin on behalf of the meeting, and said that success was now assured. The sale will be held in February, 1896, in the week before Lent.

A Church paper states that six hundred new Prayer-books have been presented to Sheffield Parish Church by Mr. Arthur Jackson for the use of worshippers. Mr. Jackson's liberality is creditable to him, but one is surprised to learn that Sheffield church-goers are so ill-provided with Prayer-books as his gift seems to imply. There is no excuse for even casual worshippers not bringing their own Prayer-books. Hymn-books, we should have thought, would have been more to the purpose, for it is impossible to guess beforehand what particular one will be found in use at a church where one is not in the habit of attending.

PREBENDARY SHELFORD ON MIRACLES.

On Wednesday, the 12th, in connection with the June lectures of the London Diocesan Church Reading Union, atSS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., at 1.15 p.m., Prebendary Shelford said :—

The miracles of our Lord have been attacked in three different ways. They have been called—(1) pious frauds ; (2) myths) ; (3) the exercise of natural forces then generally unknown. As to the first, we cannot conceive that a good man could perpetrate a "fraud," however pious. Our Lord is acknowledged to be pre-eminently good ; He was incapable of fraud. As to the second, we are told that our Lord was a great moral teacher, and that the miracles were an afterthought woven into the accounts of His life by His devoted and admiring disciples. But remark ; the miracles of our Lord and His discourses are inseparable ; many a moral discourse of His turns upon some miracle ; many a miracle results in a moral discourse. The defenders of the "myth" view are driven into a corner. If you give up the miracles, you must give up the discourses too ; then subtract both discourses and miracles from the Gospels, and what have you left? Have you enough to convert the world? Have you enough to account for the great growth and influence of Christianity, which has spread civilisation and brotherly love over the earth? Lastly, as to the third, we know, of course, that the world of Christ's day was ignorant of much which we now know of natural powers and forces ; ordinary things in medical, electrical, and other sciences to-day would have been reckoned miracles then. But think ; would it not be a miracle in itself for a simple Galilean peasant to have foreseen and foreknown such powers? The argument at once falls to the ground.

Now we are told that, because miracles do not happen, they cannot happen; that they conflict with what is thought to be the law of nature, as found by modern science. Yet in ourselves we know that we can prevent the laws of nature from operating at certain times and under certain conditions. We know that mind is greater than matter ; we can control our bodies. If this is so with us, ought we not to assume that it is much more so with the God who governs all things? Now assume that the Incarnation is a fact, that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, we at once see how mighty works could show themselves forth in Him. It has been well said that the miracles which He did amounted only to the natural workings of nature performed instantaneously instead of by degrees. Nature turns water into wine, multiplies food, and raises the dead. If the miracles do nothing more, they at least keep alive the conviction that there is One in heaven who is Victor over every form of evil and misfortune, and will bring us safe through all.

Next Wednesday the Rev. J. Macarthur will lecture on "The Resurrection."

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK.—Jacob's Vision (Gen. xxviii. 10-22). Introduction.—Jacob left his home and bade farewell to his mother; but the covenant which the Lord made departed not. He set out as a solitary traveller; he had to pass through anxious vicissitudes, what he had measured to his brother was measured to him. In his journey, when nearing one of Abraham's encampments, he took the stones lying about and put them for a pillow, and lay down to sleep; and there appeared a remarkable vision of the night. A ladder appeared to rise from the ground and reach to the very heavens, and angels ascending and descending; and a voice came assuring him of protection, and renewing to him the promise made to Abraham. Jacob awoke trembling and afraid, and made a promise to God that he would, if God would sustain him in all his ways, dedicate the spot as His House, and would give Him the tenth of all that he possessed. We notice the covenants which the Lord makes are sure and steadfast; His faithfulness never departs.

> Direct, control, suggest this day,
> All I design, or do, or say;
> That all my powers, with all their might,
> In Thy sole glory may unite.

Our chequered life upon earth is sometimes hard to bear; but this life is one of moral discipline, pointing to a higher life above; and oh, brethren, the path of duty must necessarily not be given up. If it is, we are retreating, falling back to the enemy's ground, and ultimately suffer defeat. Jacob was refreshed and encouraged by the presence of God. This is enough.

> We only see the path is long
> By which we have to go;
> We only feel the foes are strong
> Who seek to work our woe.

We may apply a few practical lessons:—1. God must be our guide. 2. The vanities of the world are not satisfying. 3. The world cannot give the soul lasting comfort. 4. We need the comforting assurance of God's blessing and presence in life and death. —THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arkell, Rev. John Norris, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Wakefield; Rector of Hinxhill-with-Brook, Kent.

Baillie, Rev. A. V., B.A., Curate of St. Mark's, Plumstead; Vicar of St. Margaret's, Plumstead.

Ball, Rev. F., M.A.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Britannia*.

Barnacle, Rev. H. E., Rector of Alderton-with-Grafton Regis; Rector of Stanwick St. Lawrence, Higham Ferrers.

Birley, Rev. Cuthbert William, B.A., Curate of Chester-le-Street; Vicar of St. Peter's, Swinton, Manchester.

Browne, Rev. W. C., M.A., Vicar of Netheravon; Vicar of Haynes, Bedford.

Clark, Rev. A. J., Curate of St. Mark's, Lyncombe; Rector of Westley Waterless, Cambridgeshire.

Coe, Rev. Hector Albert, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Cardiff; Vicar of St. Dyfrig, Cardiff.

Crick, Rev. Walter, M.A., Curate of Bengeo; Vicar of Arundel.

Currey, Rev. R. H. A., Senior Curate of Whitechapel Parish Church; Chaplain of the Missions to Seamen for the Port of Hull.

Davies, Rev. R. W. F., Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Tenby; Rector of Llandrindod, Wells.

Dean, Rev. F. Rothwell, B.A., Curate of Christ Church, Moss Side; Secretary of the National Society for Hulme Deanery.

Douglas, Rev. E. K., M.A., Curate of Alverstoke; Rector of Cheveley, Newmarket.

Druce, Rev. Gerald W., M.A., Rector of Leaden Roding; Secretary of the National Society for Roding Deanery.

Evans, Rev. John, B.A., late Curate of Llangattock-with-Llangenny, Breconshire; Vicar of Llanrthwl, Breconshire.

Farrer, Rev. H. R. W., M.A., Vicar of Broadwinsor; Rector of Bridport.

Faussett, Rev. Thomas V., A.M., Curate of Kilmore; Incumbent of Arva, Diocese of Kilmore.

Gillespie, Rev. Canon H. J., D.D., Incumbent of Castletownarra and Youghalarra; Incumbent of Finnoe, Terryglass, and Aglishclohane, Diocese of Killaloe.

Grant, Rev. Charles, Vicar of St. Benedict's, Glastonbury; Surrogate for the Diocese of Bath and Wells.

Hunt, Rev. Herbert Falkner, M.A., Rector of Allora, Queensland; Vicar of Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Jebb, Rev. Heneage Horsley, M.A., Vicar of Awliscombe, Honiton; Rector of Battlesden-with-Pottesgrove, Woburn.

Kingston, Rev. J., Chaplain, R.N., late Rector of Cattistock, Dorset; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Chichester.

Pendlebury, Rev. J. R., M.A., Senior Curate of Prestwich; Chaplain of the House of Mercy, Clewer.

Prince, Rev. J. H., B.A., Curate of St. Matthias's, Plymouth; to the Charge of Bedford Church, Exeter.

Pritchitt, Rev. J. F. Stephen, Curate of All Saints', Cheltenham; Vicar of Bledlow, Bucks.

Richards, Rev. Robert, Rector of Darowen; Secretary of the National Society for Cyfeiliog Deanery.

Sullivan, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Vicar of Hulme Walfield; Organising Secretary for the Archdeaconry of Macclesfield of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

Taylor, Rev. Thomas, Incumbent of Stradbally; Incumbent of Kilnasoolagh, Diocese of Killaloe.

Teape, Rev. C. R., M.A., Assistant-Chaplain of the Missions to Seamen for London; Assistant Association Secretary of the Missions to Seamen for the Metropolitan District and adjacent Counties.

Thompson, Rev. Robert, Curate of Faringdon, Berks; Vicar of Longcot-with-Fernham, Faringdon.

Thomson, Rev. J. E., Curate of Ludderdown, Gravesend; West London Clergyman.

Tottenham, Rev. Edward, M.A.; Rector of Thurning, Oundle.

Walker, Rev. J. M., M.A.; Vicar of Harrold, Bedford.

Watson, Rev. Charles Octavius, M.A., Vicar of Bothenhampton; Vicar of Walditch, Bridport (by dispensation).

Whitington, Rev. Frederick T., LL.B., Canon of St. David's, Hobart, Tasmania; Archdeacon of Hobart and Administrator of the Diocese, *in absentiâ episcopi*.

Wilson, Rev. J. R., M.A.; Rector of Cavendish, Suffolk.

Wood, Rev. James Hathorn Roworth, B.A., Rector of Thorpe, Newark; Perpetual Curate of Cotham, Notts.

Woodhouse, Rev. F. C., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone; Rural Dean of Elham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baines, Rev. Francis Arthur, at Shepton Mallet, on the 7th inst. aged 79,

Evans, Rev. Howard Heber, B.A., formerly Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford, at Fairleigh, Exbourne, North Devon, on the 8th inst., aged 52.

Maunsell, Rev. W. F., A.B., Rural Dean of Askeaton, Diocese of Limerick, and for forty-six years Incumbent of Kildimo, at the Glebe, Kildimo, co. Limerick, on the 10th inst., aged 74.

Monahan, Rev. J. H., D.D., Canon and Precentor of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, at 44, Rutland-square, Dublin, on the 14th inst., aged 80.

Price, Rev. William, for twenty years Chaplain of the English Church at Memel, on the 10th inst.,

Ramus, Rev. Charles Meade, Rector of Playden and East Guildford, on the 10th inst., aged 74.

Vernon, Rev. Henry John, B.A., Magdalen Hall, Oxford, Assistant-Secretary S.P.G, 1846-66, Vicar of Eckington, Worcestershire, 1866-77, at Richmond House, Boughton, Chester, on the 10th inst., aged 77.

Ward, Rev. Richard, B.A., Vicar of St. George's and Rural Dean of Newcastle-under-Lyme, at Marlborough, on the 6th inst., aged 52.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

By the Rev. CHARLES GORE, Canon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford on the Afternoon of Sunday May 12th, 1895.

"Go ye . . . . and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—St. Matt. xxviii. 19.

NO one can be at all acquainted with the feelings of the more educated classes towards the services of the Church of England without knowing that there is a more or less continual distress or irritation caused in the minds of a considerable number of people by the recitation of what is called the Athanasian Creed. There is no special agitation on the subject at the present moment. But there is always sufficient annoyance and questioning abroad to warrant the discussion of it. And as it is notoriously difficult to assign a profitable function to our Sunday afternoon University sermons, I hope I may be pardoned if, laying aside for to-day all intention of preaching a sermon, I endeavour to deal with what would be more properly called the *Quicunque vult*, in view of the complaints which we are continually hearing in regard to it.

The exact date of the document is disputed, and for our present purpose unimportant. For it belongs, at any rate, to what may be called the middle period of Latin theology, the period which extends from the end of the theological activity of Augustine to the beginnings of scholasticism. This is the least philosphical period of theology. In many of the earlier Latin theologians—Tertullian, Hilary, Victorinus—the speculative or philosophical element is as prominent as among the Greek-speaking fathers. Augustine himself is among the most distinguished of the Christian theologians who transferred to Christianity the resources of contemporary Platonism. But in his thought and writings we observe how the regulative, governmental aspect of Latin Christianity becomes dominant. The deeper aspects of the Godhead, the attempt to arrive at the exact truth in the interpretation of the New Testament, are alike subordinated to the necessity of presenting Christianity as an effective dogmatic discipline—in other words, all other tasks of the theologian are subordinated to the one task of lifting the dogmas of the Trinity and of the Incarnation into such unmistakable emphasis and distinctness as admitted no kind of ambiguity, and enabled them to be used as instruments in educating untaught races without possibility of mistake. When the Latin language had once been moulded to this end—notably by Augustine and Leo the Great—the Church for many centuries was content simply to use it without any serious amount of further reflection. The writer of the theological tracts ascribed to Boetius does indeed devote himself to the philosophical explication of theological terms, and John Scotus Erigena stands almost alone as a philosophical theologian—one, too, of a courage bordering on audacity—in the ninth century. Otherwise the period of nearly seven centuries from Augustine at the one end to Berengar and Anselm, introducing the scholastic metaphysics, at the other, is destitute of a philosophical theology. It devotes itself to another not less important or interesting task—that of ruling and disciplining by the aid of a revealed truth, embodied in clearly cut dogmatic forms, the rough races who formed the material of modern Europe, availing itself in this way for the purposes of government of the results arrived at by theological thought and the interpretation of Scripture, through the combined genius of Greece and Rome, in the Church of the previous age.

For this is what had been going on in the previous age, the period of the great councils. Certain vigorous attempts to explain and rationalise, or rather to explain away, the Christian doctrine of God and of Christ—the attempts especially of Arius, of Apollinarius, of Nestorius, had been met and repudiated. They had been shown to be fundamentally subversive of the truth which they professed to explain. Their repudiation was embodied in definite theological determinations or dogmas. These dogmas, as Mr. Arthur Balfour has truly perceived, were not explanations, but "the negation of explanations"—

> The Church held that all such partial explanations [as the great heresiarchs attempted] inflicted irremediable impoverishment on the idea of the Godhead which was essentially involved in the Christian revelation. They insisted on preserving that idea in all its inexplicable fulness; and so it has come about that while such simplifications as those of the Arians, for example, are so alien and impossible to modern modes of thought, that if they had been incorporated with Christianity they must have destroyed it, the doctrine of Christ's Divinity still gives life and reality to the worship of millions of pious souls, who are wholly ignorant both of the controversy to which they owe its preservation, and of the technicalities which its discussion has involved.

Mr. Balfour is quite right surely. The dogmas were negative rather than positive. But the result was an augmented emphasis and distinction and freedom in positive statement. The doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation need not have lost at all in this process, either in spirituality or truth to Scripture. If, in fact, they were allowed to lose in some respects it was not owing to the

dogma, but rather to the temper and ignorance of the early Middle Ages. But in any case the doctrines gained by their emphatic dogmatic statement as instruments of positive force in disciplining the minds and lives of rude and untamed races. This was the present need of the Church—to be a school in which revealed truth should be used as an instrument of discipline, and specially in the suppression of idolatry. This—the peril of idolatry—accounts for the strenuousness of the Church when she enlisted the Franks as her fierce instruments for the suppression of Arianism. Arianism was, in theory and practice, tolerant of the worship of demi-gods. The Church dogma lifts the One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, into absolute and isolated supremacy and distinctness, and refuses to conceive any gradation of existences between the Creator and the creature. The same motive—zeal against idolatry—accounts for the seriousness of the Frankish Church in repudiating the decisions of the Eastern Second Council of Nicæa in favour of image worship. "For, although," said the Caroline books which represent the mind of Charles the Great and the Council of Frankfurt, "instructed people may avoid the common error in the worship of images, owing to the fact that they venerate not what they see but what they represent, yet, none the less, they generate scandal for the uninstructed, who venerate and worship simply what they see."

It is to this period—when the Church is occupied in using the dogma as an instrument of discipline for uninstructed people, and specially as a bulwark against idolatry, Pagan or Christian—that the *Quicunque vult* belongs. It is by a most mistaken and unfortunate use of terms that objectors to this Creed complain of it for being metaphysical. That is exactly what it is not. The period to which it belongs is essentially and markedly unmetaphysical. The scholastic period, after it, was metaphysical, and the period of Greek theology before it. The period of which the *Quicunque* is characteristic is practical, disciplinary, quite unmetaphysical. Let any one who is philosophically minded go to the previous period and he will have opportunity to study in Origen, or Athanasius, or Gregory of Nyssa, in Hilary, or Victorinus, or Augustine, the rational meaning of the dogma, the subordinaton, distinctness, and unity of the persons in the Godhead, the realities and limits of the disclosure of God made in Christ. But he must have got rid of the spirit of metaphysical inquiry, or philosophical accuracy, before he approaches the theology of the *Quicunque*. That is the theology for plain people who want and will accept a simple, authoritative discipline. It is dogmatic, ecclesiastical, disciplinary. If this so called Creed is longer than the others it is not the desire to further define truth which makes it so. It does but recite and reiterate in its first portion the dogma of the three coequal, co-essential persons in the One Godhead, which is the outcome of the Arian controversy, and in the latter portion the dogma of the Divine and human natures in the One Person of the Incarnate Christ, which is the outcome of the subsequent Christological controversies.

Nobody ought to find any difficulty in the doctrinal language of the Creed who is *first* confident that the Son of God, who was incarnate, and the Holy Spirit are with the Father really the one true God, and who is *secondly* prepared to recognise that this faith in the threefold Name may legitimately be stated in language which is clear, but (from a philosophical point of view) rough and ready, lacking in modifications and explanations, in order to guide and protect simple believers.

But you will say, why is the Creed so long if there is no love of multiplying definitions? The answer is a simple one. It is praise not, definition, that makes the Creed long. Granted that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, it follows, as a matter of course, in the mind of every theist that each of the Holy Persons is also uncreated, eternal, incomprehensible (or rather infinite—*immensus*), omnipotent, Lord, etc. The clauses which contain these additional sentences, and very many others, add nothing in the way of definition. They occupy their place simply because the Church loved to dwell in adoring thankfulness on the truth of God as He had revealed Himself in Jesus Christ. For the *Quicunque vult* is accurately described in the two earliest titles we find applied to it. It is first called *Fides Catholica*, a statement or an explanation of the faith of the Catholic Church; as such, it is required by a Council of Autun that the clergy of all degrees should be acquainted with it. But next it is called a "hymn," or "Psalm" of the faith. And this is the best name for it. The Psalm *Quicunque vult*. It is (like the *Te Deum*) a composition, in which the Divine object of Christian faith becomes also the object of Christian adoration and praise, and it is the love of drawing out and reiterating the phrases in which this praise finds expression—this, and this only, that makes the *Quicunque* so long. The later title applied to the document—that of *symbolum* or creed—is a less fortunate one because the document has never been used either as a baptismal profession of the faith of a Christian or as a dogmatic document, like the Nicene Creed, with its dogmatic phrase "of one substance with the Father," which clergy should be required to subscribe as a condition of Catholic communion. The hymn, *Quicunque vult*, has never been used as a formula for subscription. It is a canticle rather than a creed. And its balanced, cumulative, unmodified phraseology is suitable to the language of hymnody.

Enough, I hope, has been said to indicate the temper of mind necessary for entering into the spirit of this statement of orthodoxy turned into a Psalm of praise. We must be not at all in a temper of inquiry, but in that of acceptance. We must be in frank acceptance of the Divine revelation, thankful to God for the good gift of the Catholic faith. We must be, moreover, candid Churchmen believing in the function of the Church to protect, formulate, and hand on the faith, through rough ages and for ignorant classes, as well as through philosophical ages and for educated classes. And, believing this, we must be ready to express, and, expressing, to give thanks for our faith, not as philosophers, but as common believers, in terms adapted to the common devotion rather than the exact niceties of philosophical appreciation.

But, once more (to approach another kind of difficulty experienced in regard to this formula), the faith revealed in Jesus Christ is revealed primarily for a practical object. It is the great salvation; the great instrument of our deliverance from the power of sin. The Church, therefore, to which this faith is entrusted is the way of salvation. It embodies a life redeemed from the power of evil by the power of a revealed truth, the Truth, or Name of God, the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost. As there is but one God, so there is but one revelation, or Name of God, and one deliverance or salvation based upon it. This revelation of God has been made in many parts or manners, to all nations, to all individuals more or less. But it reaches its climax in Jesus Christ. The Christian revelation supersedes all other religions as the light supersedes the twilight—supersedes them by including in a greater whole the elements of truth which each contain. In a true sense every religion may be regarded, like the Jewish, as leading up to Christ. But every religion, including the Jewish, becomes the antagonist of Christ so far as it enters on a career of rivalry. To reject Christ—as manifested and made known by the example of life and preaching of the Word—is to reject the light and to choose the darkness. There is one God, one Christ, one salvation based upon His Name—not alternative Gods, alternative Christs, alternative salvations. To those to whom the light comes, and who can appreciate its message, the Christian religion represents the one and only Gospel of salvation and deliverance; and the rejection of this Gospel is the choosing of death. As there is a true and eternal life based on the acceptance of the one revelation of God, so there is a true and eternal death based on a rejection of the one revelation of God. And so the *Quicunque* begins with its tremendous statement, "Whosoever wishes to be in a state of salvation (*Quicunque vult salvus esse*), it is before all things needful that he should hold the Catholic faith." For what, in fact, is the Catholic salvation but a life based upon God's revelation of Himself? To reject this revelation, which the Church is now about to recite, is, beyond all question, to reject the eternal life—the life of the spirit, and to choose the eternal death—the death of the spirit. Therefore "which faith except every one shall be found to have kept whole and inviolate, without doubt he shall die eternally." Here, again, the *Quicunque* states the truth, no doubt, without modifications or answers to the questions which thought suggests—that is, in a phraseology adapted to a psalm of praise, not to an exact statement of personal moral responsibility. The so-called "damnatory clauses," I say, give us a rough and ready statement of a great truth; it is a statement of a truth, not an anathema or "damnatory clause;" for the clauses "damn" or pass sentence upon no particular person or classes of persons. But the statement of the principle or truth is rough and ready, and affords no answer to certain questions which thought suggests. Thus—(1) What is the relation of goodness to the acceptance of revealed truth? The *Quicunque* says, as Charles Kingsley—one of its earnest advocates—was fond of pointing out, that the final judgment upon us shall be by our actions rather than by our opinions. "They that have done good shall go into life eternal, and they that have done evil into eternal fire." What is the relation of this judgment by our works to the requirement of an orthodox faith—"He therefore that wishes to be in the way of salvation let him thus hold (*sentiat*) about the Trinity?" What is to be said of a thoroughly good man who (whether by his own conviction or hereditary influences) is unorthodox? To this question there is no answer suggested in the *Quicunque*. Or, again, what is to be said of the good heathen who has never heard, or adequately heard, about Christ at all? Again, to this question—though it cannot be said that the Creed contemplates the case of the heathen at all—there is no definite answer. Thoughtful theology, earlier and later than the *Quicunque*—theology from Justin Martyr down to Roman Catholics and Anglicans and Protestants of to-day, has answered the question by saying (in varying phrases) that every man who is good up to his lights is the friend of Christ. That there is no other rejection of the Light of the World than the love of the darkness. That all men who live well will, if not in this life, yet in the many mansions beyond the grave, learn to recognise and rejoice in the truth. "In whatever hatred or contempt or blasphemy of Christ nurtured," said Dr. Pusey, God has His own elect who ignorantly worship Him, whose ignorant fear or love He who inspired it will accept." I suppose there is no decently instructed Christian who doubts this at the present day. Mr. Charles Kingsley, who surprised some of his friends by his vigorous defence of the *Quicunque vult*, used to point out that the Church-

men who composed and first sang this psalm believed intensely in the intermediate states of purgatory and paradise before the final assessment of human lives. All that can be said about this hymn truly is that it is not written in view of this difficulty or in the moral atmosphere where it is felt. It states the truth that the one covenanted deliverance from sin depends on the acceptance of the one authoritative revelation of God in Christ; and it states it without embarrassment or hesitation: again, I say, in a mode of speech suitable to a triumphant psalm of praise for the gift of the Divine revelation. Nor does it appear that the modifications which need to be introduced for the complete understanding of these warning clauses are any more than the modifications needed in any similar statement as to purely moral (not intellectual) obligations and responsibilities. We say (with the New Testament writers) that liars and fornicators shall not inherit the Kingdom of God or shall be participators in the "second death;" but we do not mean it without qualification. We do not mean that an Italian peasant or other Christian who has been brought up to think ordinary mendacity a most venial offence shall be necessarily an outcast from God, or that those, Hindoos perhaps, who have had no idea of the sin of sensual indulgence, shall be condemned for it finally. We know that to incur the guilt of any moral offence we must have the responsibility and opportunity of right knowledge. We must have sinned against the light. In the technical language of the schools, in order to be guilty we must offend not only "materially" or in fact, but also "formally" or in will and intention, knowing what we do. So to reject God's truth is to sin against God, is (finally) to reject God and be rejected of Him; but to incur that guilt we must have had the opportunity and responsibility of knowledge. The statement of the *Quicunque* is (no doubt) general. But can we get on without such general statements of right and wrong made for the purposes of government and expressed without reference to particular cases?

Viewing the *Quicunque vult* with more or less of knowledge in the true light, an ordinary orthodox Churchman ought not, I think, to find any serious difficulty, and ought on the other hand to experience much joy, in the singing or recitation of it. But it cannot be doubted that in fact there are very many who are disturbed or irritated by it—many whose worship on great festivals is hindered by it. Now, I am quite sure that a fatal way to meet these difficulties would be to displace the Creed or (what would be the most objectionable course of all) to leave it to the taste of the individual clergyman whether he would say it or no. The latter course would be the occasion of numberless offences. The former, even if initiated from some right motives, would quite certainly be understood to imply some disparagement of the importance of the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. Let us trust that any attempt to deal in either manner with the *Quicunque* will be met with the same determined opposition as it encountered twenty years ago.

I would rather meet the difficulties experienced in another way. First, let all Churchmen be educated in the true principles which the Creed embodies. The Name of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, one God, is in fact and truth the only Name of salvation. The connection between the Name and the salvation cannot be made too plain:—

> My rule (wrote Charles Kingsley) has been to preach the Athanasian Creed from the pulpit in season and out of season; to ground not merely my whole theological, but my whole ethical teaching, formally and openly in it; to prevent, as far as I could, people from thinking it a dead *formula*, or even a string of intellectual dogmas.
>
> Do you, who come to church (wrote the great thinker, Frederick D. Maurice) wish to be saved from those courses which assuredly are destroying you and will destroy you, let your profession be what it may: then hold the Catholic faith which you say you hold. Believe in the Name into which you are baptised, the Name in which you and all men are living and moving and having your being. The Name of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is, as the Fathers and schoolmen said continually, the Name of the Infinite charity, the perfect love, the full vision of which is that beatific vision for which saints and angels long even while they dwell in it. To lose this, to be separated from this, to be cut off from the Name in which we live and move and have our being is everlasting death."—*Life of F. D. Maurice* (Macmillans), Vol. II., pp. 413, 563.

Secondly, let us learn something of the breadth, the largeness of our Catholic Church. It is an immense privilege surely to belong to a society which has endured through so many ages, and which is suited to contain all classes, conditions, and races of men. We ought to dwell more on this privilege. But it is sure to carry with it some accompanying burden. For example—it is conceivable, though improbable, that a Book of Common Prayer drawn up to suit one class in one age, might contain nothing distasteful to any of that class or age. This, I say, is conceivable; but it is hardly conceivable that a "Book of Common Prayer," a large part of which consists of devotions common to all Christian ages and classes should not contain something distasteful to a particular age or class—but not for that reason unnecessary—should not, in particular, contain what jars upon that peculiar sensitiveness to dogmatic claims which characterises educated circles at the present moment. The statements in the *Quicunque vult* are, in fact, statements of truth—unqualified, no doubt, as a very intellectually sensitive class would wish them qualified, but in broad simplicity and effectiveness statements of abiding truth. And this kind of unqualified dogmatic statement is, we can easily conceive, just the kind of statement in which truth needs to be enshrined, if it is to last unimpaired through ages of wild barbarism, rough negligence, or shallow latitudinarianism and un-

spirituality. What do we not owe to the sharp, unmistakably emphasised, language of the *Quicunque* for preserving the faith in the Blessed Trinity, one only God, through ages when idolatry was a continual peril, or through such a spiritually dead age, such a *seculum rationalisticum* as the last century in the English Church? What do we not owe to the *Quicunque* for preserving the faith or, shall I say, the skeleton of the faith, always ready to be reclothed in the sinews and flesh of a living devotion, and inspired by the vitalising spirit of God, as by a wind that bloweth where it listeth? I am assuming that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is the safeguard of the practical truth of our redemption, and of the verity that God is personal and God is love. I am assuming that, because I cannot stay to show it. But granted that, did not the truth need encasing in a stout armour to persist through wild days? Did it not need utterance in unmistakable tones if it was to ring on through an age utterly averse to mystery and depth? And are we not narrow-minded if we fail to rejoice in an utterance like this, because we should like it moderated and modulated to suit an over-intellectualised sensitiveness, a sensitiveness somewhat absorbed in its own difficulties and unsympathetic to the broader wants of common man? No kind of religion more needs broadening than academic and intellectual religion. It is always forgetting how much more common are the religious needs and perils which arise from dulness and grossness, than those which arise from a temper of intellectual inquiry. And the Church is Catholic—the mother of all sorts and conditions of men. It was a poet who wrote in real sympathy with common religious feelings who called the *Quicunque* the—

> Majestic march! as meet to guide and time
> Man's wandering path in life's ungenial clime,
> As Aaron's trump for the dread ark's array,
> Creed of the saints and anthem of the blest!

Thirdly, it might be possible to relieve some difficulty felt in regard to this profession of faith if a few of its terms were to be translated, and if a note were appended which should plainly state the fact that the guilt of any sin, and therefore the guilt of rejecting the faith, is only incurred by those who both transgress in fact, and also know that they are doing and intend to do it. The guilt of rejecting God and His truth can never be incurred by one who really "willeth to do His will." It is also possible that, as time goes on, it may be desirable to admit alteration in the present position of the Creed in our services, so that it may both be preserved in memory, and also may more truly appear as a psalm of praise. At present, as it is recited in the course of the morning service, those are required to join in it—the wealthier classes, who chiefly frequent our morning service—amongst whom are the greater number of those who misunderstand and are irritated by it. The poor and the increasing number of devouter worshippers who frequent the Eucharist in the morning and then the evening service, and who are in many cases absent almost always from Morning Prayer, never join in it at all. The tendency to make the Eucharist the chief service of the morning may be expected to increase. It is at least possible that the example of St. Barnabas Church in the city might be followed with advantage and the *Quicunque vult* sung as a psalm of praise, or as a marching hymn for procession, in the evening service. In this way it might remain familiar to the mass of Church worshippers, while its true character as a canticle of praise might better appear.

In conclusion, let it be said, we must never forget the only true meaning of breadth in connection with the Church. It is broad because it is a society based on a revelation of the Divine Name which is adequate for all men and all ages, which expresses the eternal and essential fellowship of Divine love—the name of the coequal Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God. The Church is a society based on this truth. Let it be as broad as the open and unhesitating confession of the Divine Name can allow it, or rather make it to be. The belief in the Creeds and Scriptures which proclaim His name, the practical fellowship in the ministry, the sacraments, and the worship of the Church---this is an adequate basis of unity on which we can build in free allowance of manifold differences. But the underlying faith and the practical fellowship in common worship and sacraments, these are essentials of the life of the Church. For the Church to be broad, in the sense of being indifferent to the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation, would be to lose the very meaning of her being, for she is in the world as this and nothing but this—a society embodying a life of goodness and love, based upon the confession of the threefold Divine Name. "Go ye," said our Lord, "and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world."

BOTH Houses of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury will meet for the despatch of business, at Westminster, on Tuesday next, at 11 o'clock. The House of Laymen meets at 1.30.

ARCHDEACON WOOSNAM has been appointed a vice-president of the Missions to Seamen, in recognition of the work he has achieved for the benefit of sailors and fishermen during the last sixteen years in various chaplaincies of the Missions to Seamen in the Bristol Channel, on the Tyne, and on the Mersey. The Archdeacon has now retired from the senior chaplaincy of the Mersey, where he is to be succeeded by the Rev. Edgar Lambert.

STRANGERS AND PILGRIMS ON EARTH.

By the Rev. GEORGE MURTON, M.A.

Sermon Preached at the Church St. Mary-at-the-Walls, Colchester, on Sunday, August 12th, 1894.

"Strangers and pilgrims on the earth."—Heb. xi. 13.

UNDOUBTEDLY there is such a thing as clinging to life. We witness it in many around us, and feel it in ourselves. But with just as little doubt there is another thing to observe and to set over against that—readiness to give up when the time has actually come, and to depart. A gifted writer has lately reminded us of this latter fact, giving to her essay the strange, yet appropriate title, "The Art of Dying." * And surely one is bound to pause and think upon reading words like these: "The fact is that, vary as they may, it is rare to find a death-bed destitute of dignity. Almost all examples point to this, that courage in respect to death, when it is near at hand, is so general as to come near to being universal." And these further words: "Among the surprises which meet us in this inquiry, and perhaps one of the chiefest, is the *unimportance of the influence apparently exercised by surroundings* upon those who are called upon to leave them. . . . . We discover that it is just those who have been the most honoured guests at the banquet who appear readiest at the first summons to rise, and, without a backward glance, to quit it: and that it is such as have in the fullest sense lived who are the most willing to part with life."

And yet, strange as the words may sound at first, and almost novel, the strangest thing of all is this, that when we come to think about them a little longer, the ideas themselves seem to be quite familiar ones, and borne out by such experience as we ourselves have had whereby to prove them. Is it not that our own thoughts are put into shape for us—certainly I know that mine are—better expressed than I could have put them, and with greater brilliance and more extended knowledge; but I know now that, as far as my own personal experience has gone, whether as a spectator of people in general, or as a closer witness of the sojourn and the departure of acquaintances, friends, and relatives, these are two of the things which have impressed me most:

1. That, however there may be a natural terror of death in life, a shrinking from the grizzly spectre, still when death comes, very few seem really afraid of it; and

2. That, however engrossed in a worldly career men and women may be, at the last their hold upon the world seems generally very slight—very slight indeed."

"The influence exercised by surroundings upon those called upon to leave them is apparently unimportant." Brethren, I would venture to say that, if you will think over the matter in the light of your own experience, you will find that these impressions are also your own, and the ideas of this writer really familiar to yourselves; and if so, you will be asking with me, What can the meaning of this be? If these impressions be truths, whither do such truths tend? What do they actually imply?

They certainly contradict popular phraseology—I do not say "thought," for it is not thought—but they do not agree with what is frequently said, and maintained more especially from the Christian stand-point, thoughtlessly maintained, but still so commonly, and taken for granted so easily as almost to assume the authority and gain the hold of articles in an authorised creed.

1. It is said, and easily supposed, that most, unless buoyed up by a Christian faith, greatly fear death when it comes; but experience teaches us that for the most part there is no such fear.

2. Again, it is said that, unless the affections have been set upon things above, and the citizenship been consciously in heaven, there is great and almost universal unwillingness to let go the things below, resolute clinging to life at last. But once more experience teaches us that generally this, in the end, is not so; that the hold on the world is only a passing one, the interest in things here slight, the influence of surroundings upon those called upon to leave them apparently quite unimportant.

These are phenomena which imperatively demand recognition and some attempt at explanation from us; and although such explanation must of necessity be incomplete, yet it need not on that account be false in itself.

What, then, can these things mean? In the first place, the unreality of death is much emphasised by the way in which men meet it. It sounds a commonplace to say this, but at least it is indicated in no ordinary way. I do not mean that all appear to have hope, or indeed expectations of any kind whatsoever; but it does seem to onlookers as though, when the time came, it was discovered that there was nothing solid to encounter. Perhaps before it had been thought of as a hard boundary, or something crushing and annihilating; but now when it comes the substance is dissolved in shadow, and the whole catastrophe is a passing away. The question, of course, remains, Passing to what? but that is not just now the point. But the point of profound interest is, that at last and on the whole almost universally, death appears to lose its bulk and outline and definition, those points which beforehand have loomed so threateningly before the mind's eye. There is no reality in it of the kind once supposed. At the worst it is a going into shadow; at the best it is a passing into light.

But it is a passing, and therefore life here is known to be a phase, a chapter, but not the only one. That, again, may sound a commonplace, but

* *Nineteenth Century.*

then it is not quite the same—not at all the same—as saying that life is transitory, and a vapour, and soon passes away. This is true, indeed, but not inspiring; too much insistence in regard to it may be demoralising. But when close and general observation seems to tell us clearly that death itself is to all a passing away, not a meeting with any obstacle, and so a falling on sleep, with an awakening to something, then we say that life here is a chapter in a history, a part of a whole, and that it must be a very important part, because so much has led up to it. It is such a glorious development of all that has gone before; it has been evolved so laboriously and so wonderfully by the Creator's will. It is the highest development as yet, and knowing as we do that it is not the end, but only a brief chapter, it is clear that it will develop further and higher yet, and therefore in a real sense the future is depending on the present and weighting it with grand responsibility.

We talk lightly at times about this wilderness world; but that must be wrong. Life here is a process in the evolution of all that is highest and best; and if we would compare it with the journey of the Israelites of old to the land of Canaan, let us remember that the wandering in the wilderness was the result of their faithlessness. The journey should have been direct through the land of their enemies; and inasmuch as our life is a process, an advance towards a higher development, the history of their wearisome wandering may serve only as a warning, whilst we may well take the moral of God's command to them in the first days of their enterprise, as they stood in perplexity with the sea in front and the hosts of Pharaoh behind: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward." So considered, however frequently it be repeated, it is not a commonplace, but an inspiring and an enabling thought.

Then in regard to the general readiness with which people resign their work, their interests, and their pursuits in life, the very slight hold which surroundings have upon those called upon to leave them—what can be said?

At the outset a very familiar phrase recurs to contradict the whole idea: "The ruling passion strong in death." I am sure that is the exception, and not the rule; of course, I mean in those cases where consciousness is retained. The rule is that the interest of life is forgotten, as an interest. Have you not observed how it appears to be suddenly dropped? It is a most noticeable phenomenon. The earthly surrounding seems to fall away. I do not know anything which inspires with greater awe. It is not only those possessed with a fixed hope of the beyond, but nearly all, who at last say, or intimate unmistakably, "These things do not interest me now." In point of fact, they are being left behind—a simple, but the sole explanation, and the truth indicated is, "The end of the creation of man is not material, but spiritual;" or, as some, perhaps, would put it, "The end of evolution is not material, but spiritual," which seems to imply the same thing. Not material, but spiritual; the material being a vehicle for the conveyance of a purpose at the time; the material being the expression of a process, only required until such process is complete.

When the earthly period is over, in the case of all, all alike, there is a conscious leaving of those things which are behind; we can see it as we watch. But not yet in the case of all is there the conscious reaching out after such things as are before. This also we learn as we stand by and watch.

What is it which could make such a reaching out universal? It is the recognition of the spiritual end of man—that he was created and elaborated into life in order to live to the Spirit; and what is it which enables such a recognition? It is the principle of love made our own. As Christians we are possessed by such a principle, the love of God through Christ sacrificing Himself for us and leaving an example; and we are told—though I cannot claim authority to speak, still we are told—that scientifically the same thing holds good, and that the end is almost coming into view: that altruism, as opposed to any merely selfish struggle, is a very potent factor in evolution now, and the sure development of things, and that on altruistic lines spirituality is in course of being evolved, that all tends towards it.*

Well, another name for altruism is charity, or love, which is the motive, the impulse of our Christian life; and so we are supported from without, and the principle of our faith shown to be entirely reasonable, and the only one which will stand. Anyhow, such a scientific doctrine and our Christian creed indicate a rise to higher things. God grant that, if it be right, they may harmonise and prove mighty to convince and to impel. They show that life here is not complete in itself, not aimless, not a wandering, not material, but a passing on, and emphatically an ascent—an ascent to spiritual realms. We have only to believe such a thing to know how to live, to live literally in preparation for entrance there, as we press towards the mark for the prize of our high calling: and although on this view the only reasonable thing to say to one another is, Prepare to meet thy God, on the other hand, it has no threatening sound. It is the only natural thing, is reassuring and welcome and inspiring, simply because it reminds us of our glorious destiny, and it is a song in the night, a word of encouragement to those who, having been redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, are now expecting to be gathered together into the courts of that God who is a Spirit, and to be worshipped for ever in spirit and in truth.

* Drummond's "Ascent of Man."

NOTICES.

Al communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d. twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1895.

LIKE LUCIFER.

THE circumstances under which the Government have fallen constitute their crowning condemnation. We have always maintained that they were singularly deluded, deceiving themselves and suffering themselves to be deceived by others. Self-convinced, by some extraordinary process, that they had right with them, and the people behind them, they entered, with a heterogeneous and exiguous majority, upon an overloaded and highly contentious programme, consisting of measures, some embryonic, all immature, not one of which was demanded by the country, while some menaced the Constitution and the Empire, or, at least, seemed to do so to persons quite as competent to judge and quite as worthy of confidence as the statesmen who have just been driven from office. In pursuit of these fond things vainly invented, the Ministers have been wilfully blind to the signs of the times. They have deliberately endeavoured to arouse sentiments which they acknowledged were not in existence. They have refused to see the absolute failure of these endeavours, and have construed each token of public dissatisfaction into a commission to remain longer in office. What seemed to all ordinary persons a strong hint to go, the Government has taken as an invitation to stay. The year has not revolved full circle since the Premier boasted that he could carry out his revolutionary programme with a majority of one. Not a month has passed since Mr. Morley staked his reputation as a prophet that the chief items in his little list would be completed before the close of the session. During the Whitsuntide recess the Radical newspapers shouted for the gag in the Welsh Disestablishment debate, in order that the rest of the legislation might be pressed on for which the country was hungering and thirsting. Last Friday the *Westminster Gazette* came out with the heading "No Case for Crisis," and actually, while the paper was selling in the streets, the Government whom it was urging to go on and prosper had fallen. Never was there a clearer instance of the fatuous policy of clinging to your own infallibility and only listening to the prophets who prophesy smooth things.

Reluctant to confess the wound to their self-esteem, the Radical party, for the most part, still attempt to keep the deception which has at last failed to deceive. They describe the Government defeat as not significant, as a "snap vote," as a "dirty trick." It is of unusual significance, as amounting to a direct vote of censure upon the most popular and most influential member of the Cabinet. It was not a "snap vote" for it was deliberately challenged by the minister concerned; it was moved by an ex-minister, and was supported by the Leader of the Opposition and the Front Bench. The libellous attempts to dispose of it as a "dirty trick" are disposed of by the facts that no special whip was made of the Opposition, and that at the beginning of the debate Ministerialists were present in more than their normal majority. Why they failed to go into the lobby remains to be seen. Mr. Brodrick's motion raised a question of Imperial importance, and the vote of the House plainly censured the Secretary of State for War for having failed in the precautions necessary for the safety of the Empire.

To describe the catastrophe as improbable and unexpected is wide of the truth, though it was naturally unforeseen by politicians who have made up their minds to see and hear nothing disagreeable. Anyone but a fool can see clearly enough that it is not possible for a not very harmonious or united Government to carry on with a majority which has sunk to a single figure, and which any accident, to say nothing of any awkward internal dissension, may reduce to a cypher. Administration alone, without any efforts at legislation, would be impossible, to say nothing of such legislation as the Government proposed. It is inconceivable that responsible and experienced statesmen should have imagined the nation would acquiesce in a state of things under which the fate of the Church, the House of Lords, and other grave public issues, might depend upon whether two or three country gentlemen were late for dinner, or whether a drunken platelayer or a sleepy signalman blocked a train. From the moment that the Opposition determined to turn them out at the first opportunity, the fate of Ministers was sealed, and the only question was of days, perhaps of hours.

So strong, however, is the faculty of self-deception, or so extremely pachydermatous is the official race of men, that the Radicals were half-

disposed to hang on to the bitter end. A whole day's deliberation hardly sufficed to make up the Ministeral mind. The protracted Cabinet Councils show that some Ministers must have been extremely reluctant to accept their dismissal. There are people whom nothing short of a kick can persuade that they are not wanted, and some of them were in the Cabinet. Fortunately more decent (the word dignified would be out of place, counsels have prevailed, and the country will have the long-delayed opportunity of finally pronouncing upon the nostrums which have been impudently advertised in its name.

Mr. Gladstone's conduct will be matter of interesting speculation. Many Radicals have never parted with the hope that he would once more be tempted forth to be their champion. We think it most unlikely. The last act of Mr. Gladstone has been to deal at the Government which, took his name in vain, a blow more mischievous than the loss of a by-election. The withdrawal of his pair with Mr. Villiers was a piece of hostile criticism which subsequent explanation has only served to emphasise. It may have done a good deal to hasten the catastrophe. Whatever be the possibilities of his marvellous vitality and unrivalled powers of mind and body, it is not probable that they will be expended in the pursuit of objects which he has not originated, with which he has scant sympathy, and of which he cannot hope to see the development.

THE FINALE OF THE NEWCASTLE PROGRAMME SUPPORTERS.

(*From an Irish Correspondent.*)

HE would be a poor patriot and a cripple of a Christian, who could not recognise and rejoice over the overthrow of the Government in (not of) England, who stood upon the Newcastle Programme. After a long and fevered time of Parliamentary non-progress, at last doom has overtaken these conspirators. One cannot but see that the fate of conspirators has fallen on these men. Let people say what they like, God Almighty may allow men to follow the "devices and desires of their own hearts," but He calls them to account, with a certainty and severity of retribution often proportioned exactly to His extreme patience. They fell on a point outside "the Programme," incidental and unsuspected. Where they were the strongest in administrative ability there the blow fell. But, why did it crush? Why was the House so thin? Where were their great and grim battalions of blind supporters? These—the Irish, the Scotch, the fanatic Teetotallers, the Trades Union men, and even the Welshmen, were absent and unpaired, and on Supply, too, which is so ticklish a branch of Parliamentary experience. Why were they absent? Why were only about one-third of the party at hand, to ward off fate? To explain this, one has to analyse the elementary constituents of conspiracies, and the effects of these on the conspirators themselves. One of the most striking expositions of all this is found in the 1st chapter of the Book of Proverbs, verse 10, etc. Here we have the argument of "the sinners that entice," who have neither mercy nor honour, nor patriotic devotion. The greed of gain is their strong appeal, and the honour of thieves their sole dependence—"Cast thy lot among us. Let us have one purse." Now, excluding the theory of Auguste Comte, here so plainly foreshadowed, we find the weak point of all immoral combinations exemplified; unless success crowns their cursed fraternizings all at once, time defeats them. While the greed of gain is growing apace, and "their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed blood;" animosity arises, jealousy works, envy corrodes, disappointment embitters, and then this band of wolves turns on each other, their very ravenings of hunger inciting them to a blinder distrust and mutual intensity of fiercer rage. Yes, time tests all things, because it gives scope for realities to develop and for pretences to die out, and so the Parnellite becomes virtuous and unpurchasable. The Macarthyite is not satisfied with his irresponsible domination in respect of whisky duties and landlord annihilation and municipal exclusion; above all, he has never forgiven Lord Rosebery for putting off repeal until England becomes convinced. So this strong support is absent in the strain that tries. The canny Scotch have been gradually opening their eyes to the certainty that if Irish Home Rule prevails, they are left in the lurch; also, unlike the days of James II., there is a strong and close tie of the common interests between the Presbyterians of Ireland and of Scotland established and recognised. This has created a complex antagonism and whetted a cutting jealousy. Above all, Lord Rosebery on Toryism in Manses galls them. The Trades' Union man finds himself baffled by the realities of controlling trade and production, which are so far below his expectations, and looking at his actual share of "the swag," is almost ashamed of himself. Larger sacrifices of truth, broader exhibitions of ferocious intolerance, have been made by Mr. Asquith to "Taffy." But "Taffy does not come to the rescue, and he allows the Cave of Cacus to be rifled, and the eye of the great giant Cyclops (Mr. Bannerman), to be extinguished, not with fire, but for the want of it.

And so the conspiracy to make power the instrument of party, and the Parliament of England a caucus of wire-pullers, has broken down of itself, and dispersed after a weary night, like ghosts at cock-crow disappearing. It remains to be seen whether the people of England are going to be the people of England or the people of every

party elsewhere, of every faddist among themselves, of every conspirator who is a good liar, and can gather, like Mr. Gladstone, the largest number of self-seekers to pretend devotion to her interests, while their darling hope is to feather their nests and plunder their neighbours. Unless England wants to submit herself and become the slave of the Macarthyites (agents of a foreign Power), she had better change her method, drop her internal and idiotic antagonisms, and unite for once—perhaps her last chance—to hold her own, and stand independent and an Empire of men.

CHURCH NOTES.

THE necessity of some strenuous and well organised effort to improve the pecuniary position of the clergy was once more strongly emphasised at the annual meeting this week of the Curates' Augmentation Fund. Lord Cranbrook, in an earnest speech, set forth the need for affording help to the parochial clergy, who are less able than they ever were to pay curates' stipends; while Prebendary Webb-Peploe pointed out the certainty that a large proportion of the men ordained to the Ministry must die unbeneficed, and urged the consequent duty of doing something to increase their incomes. He said there were 1,300 curates who had reached the age recognised by the society for affording help, with very little prospect of preferment. At least £2,000 had been spent on their education, yet at the age of 50 their average income was about £120. The beneficed clergy had never been in such straits before, and there were now 11,000 fewer benefices than clergymen. He added, with great truth, that it can hardly be expected that parents will send their sons into the Church unless there is offered some prospect of their being able to spend their declining years in something like comfort.

The rule of the new Education Code dispensing with examination has been put in force in the parish of Christ Church, Spitalfields. The rector, the Rev. J. H. Scott, has been informed by the Inspector that, in view of the standard which the schools of the parish have reached, and for some time maintained, the full grant will be paid this year without the necessary inspection. We should not be surprised to hear that many of the Church schools in London are in a state of efficiency to justify a like concession.

The vicar of Christ Church, Lancaster-gate, the Rev. C. J. Ridgeway, whose church comes out second in the list of Hospital Sunday collections, has just published the report of his last year's work. He states that his Easter communicants numbered 1,472, the highest figure on record; while, for the first time, the contributions to Church Charities and other objects amounted to upwards of £1,000. New Communion plate has been provided through the liberality of a few members of the congregation, and a Parochial Foreign Missions Union has been established.

The total amount raised by offertories at Christ Church during the ten years has been £39,720. 9s. 8d, while £27,567 has been contributed in subscriptions and donations, making a total of upwards of £61,000. Of this amount £9,988 of the offertories and about £11,000 of other contributions were expended on the needs of the church, while £47,000 was given to poor parishes in London on both sides of the Thames, to home mission and foreign mission work, and to hospitals. Mr. Ridgeway is not a believer in the free and open church system. He ventures to think that the expenditure for outside objects which he reports would be impossible were it not that the payment for sittings meets the stipends of the clergy as well as the greater part of the church expenses.

There was an interesting discussion at the recent diocesan conference for Rochester on the question of the age of candidates for confirmation. A resolution was proposed asking the Bishop to take into consideration the advisability of confirming at an earlier age than is now usual, "with a view to securing a larger number of candidates (especially males), and also of retaining the Church's influence over the young at a critical age." Both the Bishop of Southwark and the Bishop of the diocese deprecated admitting young children to the ordinance, except in special cases. Dr. Davidson observed that he had not been the most favourably impressed in those parishes where very young candidates were presented, and he thought that if boys were confirmed at ten or twelve years of age, there was something more (which the Church has not provided) wanted when they reached the period of youth. At the same time, he would spare no pains to inquire into the circumstances of any case in which a clergyman might think it desirable to administer the rite at an early age. The matter was ultimately shelved by adopting "the previous question."

The Conference also discussed, among other subjects, a resolution moved by Canon Palmer, calling for restraint on the admission of unsuitable persons to Holy Communion. The proposal was carried, but by a small majority only. No doubt the general practice in the Church of England is as lax as it can possibly be. There is nothing to prevent anybody from approaching the Holy Table who does not conduct himself with the most obvious irreverence, and a notorious instance once occurred in which a caricaturist, not a member of the Church, actually communicated, for the purpose, as he openly avowed, of obtaining a good portrait of the officiating clergyman. Such desecrations must, however, be very rare, and probably very few clergy would be disposed to take the responsibility of questioning strangers who present themselves as communicants.

We take it, however, that the advocates of restriction have rather in view the cases of persons known to them, and whom in their judgment it would be their duty to repel, if they could do so without difficulty. But surely these are sufficiently provided for in the rubric which authorises the refusal of the Sacrament to "notorious evil-livers," subject to appeal to the Bishop. The laity would certainly not desire that any priest should be at liberty to excommunicate a parishioner, or even a casual attendant, without the aggrieved person having a right of complaint. Nor can there be many priests who would wish to exercise such uncontrolled authority.

The sisters of the Church, popularly known as the Kilburn Sisterhood, have lost the favour of the Primates. It has been authoritatively announced this week that both the Archbishops have withdrawn their patronage from the community for some months. It would be interesting to have the explanation of this,

though perhaps it is not far to seek. The Sisters have been always far more conspicuous for their zealous works of charity than for deference to authority in the Church.

The observance of the unauthorised feast of Corpus Christi, June 13th, is yearly gaining ground among a section of extreme High Churchmen. The *Church Times* says that for almost the first time in an East London church the Solemn Celebration was sung on the festival at St. Augustine's, Stepney. The music was Garrett in A, and the choir was augmented by members from Christ Church, Watney Street, and elsewhere. The church was filled by as many of the parishioners as could leave work on a week-day, with a good sprinkling of Stepney children in their pinafores, and many visitors from a distance.

The reporter on the occasion seems to have been carried away by his enthusiasm. He writes that at St. Augustine's the Sarum Use is seen in its full stately solemnity, and the ceremonial is most beautiful and dignified. "As the procession wound round the church singing 'Hail, Festal Day,' the rays of sunlight from the upper windows fell aslant on the golden vestments, and seemed to catch the ascending smoke of the incense. The music, beautiful and simple, was a fitting offering of praise, and as the hush of worship fell over the people in the realisation of the Divine Presence, a fuller grasp of sacramental truth was gained, and a clearer perception of the great worship in Heaven."

The question was asked in the House of Commons a few days ago whether a clergyman can legally refuse to marry an unbaptised person, and the Home Secretary replied that in his judgment the refusal is illegal. This dictum is challenged by Sir Walter Phillimore. Sir Walter writes that where one party to the proposed marriage is baptised and the other unbaptised, the utmost that can be said for a marriage in church is that the baptised one has a claim upon the charity of the Church, which the clergyman or his Bishop may, if he or they think it for the good of souls, admit. We take it that if both parties were unbaptised Sir Walter Phillimore would uphold the clergyman in refusing to perform the marriage. The framers of the Marriage Service undoubtedly never contemplated its use except for members of the Church.

Doctors and parsons can be mutually helpful in many ways. Sir Dyce Duckworth has just been giving an example of one. At a clerical meeting he read a paper giving some admirable advice, founded on his experience as a physician, to the physicians of souls. Among other matters, he dealt with the vexed question of Fasting Communion. That, he observed, was a practice which might be followed without harm to health by many, but as the circumstances of the fast must vary very much, it is not a practice that can be urged or enforced on all. "For myself," he said, "I recognise no supreme or special virtue in it, though I leave those who differ from me to have their own opinions, for which I have deep respect. I cannot doubt that a practice which sometimes all but induces syncope in persons by no means weakly is harmful for them, and is no necessary act of homage or adoration to a God of wisdom, love, and pity."

"As a beginning of a day of heavy work," Sir Dyce Duckworth added, "I think the practice, for most of the clergy, unwise. I recommend them and the laity to take a cup of good cocoa or tea before leaving home, and I am sorry for the scruples of conscience that anyone may have who objects to this. In any case, as a physician, I give this advice in the matter, and leave the theologists to do as they like." The doctor is doubtless aware that those who construe the rule as to fasting strictly object as much to a cup of tea as to a hearty breakfast. Even a glass of water is held to be wrong.

The Lay Helpers of the diocese of London are summoned to meet at Sion College next Tuesday evening, when the Bishop will deliver his annual address. There will be celebrations of the Holy Communion at St. Paul's on Thursday morning, for the members of the Lay Helpers' Association, followed by a breakfast at Sion College.

The English Church has been well represented in Boulogne for many years, and this week the new church of St. John's was consecrated by Bishop Wilkinson. The church has cost, including the outlay on the organ, about £6,000. The Rev. J. H. Fry may be cordially congratulated on the success which has attended his efforts.

A Liverpool journal reports that Father Chapman, formerly priest in charge of St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, Widnes, has seceded from the Church of Rome. He applied some time ago for admission to the Church of England, and has, it is stated, now been admitted. It is added that Father Chapman laboured in Widnes for a number of years, and was highly esteemed by members of every religious denomination in the town for his earnest work among the poor.

THE RESURRECTION.

In connection with the lectures arranged by the London Diocesan Church Reading Union to take place on Wednesdays during June, at 1.15 p.m., in the church of SS. Anne and Agnes, Gresham-street, E.C., the Rev. J. Macarthur said :—

The truth of the Resurrection is assailed because of its supernatural character. If it be true, the way is clear to the acceptance of lesser miracles. But it is said that miracles do not happen, and that they cannot happen, being violations of the order of nature. Were it proved that miracles are impossible, there would be an antecedent bar to all inquiry on the subject. No use collecting evidence and estimating its value, and basing conclusions upon it, if the matter in question be excluded from inquiry by inherent impossibilities. Do we know enough about God, and the order of nature, and ourselves to assert that miracles are impossible? Is not this an assumption of the reason which must be attested by the evidence of facts? If we cannot gainsay the evidence, are we justified in setting up against it what is at best a theory and an uncertain deduction?

Now, what evidence have we for the Resurrection? 1. The four principal Epistles of St. Paul, admittedly genuine, written from twenty-three to thirty years after the death of Christ. These Epistles stake Christianity on the Resurrection, and say that without it the Christian faith is vain. 2. The fact of the Christian Church. How can we account for its initiation and rapid progress, and the universal belief in the first century that the reason of its existence was the Resurrection, unless the Resurrection was true?

Now let us ask what theories are advanced to account for the universal belief in the Resurrection,

by sceptics:—1. That Jesus did not die upon the Cross; but the difficulties connected with such a theory are insuperable. 2. That the disciples were the victims of hallucinations. If so, an incredible number of persons were deceived in exactly the same way; and mark, these were not only visions, but conversations and explicit directions. Were the disciples deceived with respect to all these things? We think not.

The lecture next Wednesday will be by Canon Girdlestone on "The Atonement."

It is announced that the Bishop of Bangor, who has been directed by his medical advisers to take a complete rest, has left for Scotland.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and Mrs. Benson held their first garden party at Lambeth Palace on Saturday afternoon. The company included the Archbishop of York, and Mrs. Maclagan, Princess de Croy-Solre, the Dowager-Marchioness Conyngham and Lady Blanche Conyngham, the Marchioness Cassar de Sain, Georgina Countess of Seafield, the Countess of Lathom and Lady Edith Wilbraham, Viscount and Viscountess Cross and the Hon. Misses Cross, Viscount and Viscountess Molesworth and the Hon. Miss Molesworth, Viscount Corry, the Bishop of St. Albans, the Bishop of Brechin, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, the Bishop of Marlborough, the Bishop of Colombo, Bishop Cramer-Roberts, Viscount and Viscountess Hampden, Lord and Lady Colchester, Lord and Lady Monk-Bretton, Lord and Lady Knutsford, Lord Dynevor and the Hon. Misses Rice, Lord and Lady Eustace Cecil, Lord and Lady Hood of Avalon, Lord Addington, Lord and Lady Kelvin, the Speaker and Mrs. Gully, Mr. Henry Matthews, Mr. and Mrs. Staveley Hill, Mr. and Lady Eleanor Heneage, Mr. Mundella, Mr. and Lady Louise Loder, Sir Hugh and Lady Kay-Shuttleworth, and Sir John and Lady Mowbray.

Suggestive Outlines for Pulpit and Desk.—Christ among the Doctors (Luke ii. 40-52). Introduction.—Christ grew up like other boys, with one exception, free from sin. We are told that His earthly parents went every year to the feast of the Passover. When Jesus was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem; they returned, but Jesus stayed behind. His parents were in trouble; they began to seek for Him. At last they found Him in the Temple, after three days, sitting among the doctors and learned men. He was both hearing them and asking them questions. His parents asked Him why He had thus acted. He said, "How is it that ye sought Me? Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" We are told, nevertheless, that He was subject to His parents. Thus the early days of Jesus were spent in quietness, Jesus still increasing in wisdom and stature, and growing in favour with God and man. Yes, His Divine mind and loving heart were making ready for the development of the great work He came into the world to accomplish in behalf of man.

Come, Thou long-expected Jesus,
Born to set Thy people free;
From our fears and sins release us,
Let us find our rest in Thee.

We may learn a few lessons from this subject for our consideration:—1. Jesus taught to attend the house of God in His early days. 2. Jesus in the society of the good and learned. 3. Jesus the wisest child. 4. Jesus anxious to be about His Father's work. 5. Jesus' example to be imitated. 6. Jesus honoured His earthly parents.—Thomas Heath, Plymouth.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bardsley, Ven. Archdeacon Joseph, D.D., Vicar of Bradford; Residentiary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.

Batchelor, Rev. Robert Twiddy, Vicar of Brooke and Curate of Knapton; Rector of Letcombe Bassett, Berks.

Beck, Rev. Walter, Vicar of Cherryhinton; Rector of Scotter, Lincolnshire.

Buck, Rev. William Armstrong, M.A., London Diocesan Home Missionary for Merchant Taylors' School Mission; Perpetual Curate of Leck, Lancashire.

Buckle, Rev. W, F. R., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class.

Bunbury, Rev. Shirley, Rector of Letcombe Bassett; Vicar of Brooke, Norfolk.

Chapman, Rev. T. A., B.A., Senior Curate of St. Matthew's, Bayswater; Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, High Wycombe.

Duncan; Rev. George, M.A., Curate of Bladon-with-Woodstock; Vicar of Steeple Barton, Oxon.

Edwards, Rev. Robert Stephen, B.A., Curate of All Saints', Shrewsbury; Junior Minor Canon of Bangor Cathedral.

Farr, Rev. Charles J., M.A., formerly Curate of Clyst St. George; Vicar of Bickleigh, Devon.

Ferguson, Rev. James, Curate of Down; Incumbent of Dunsford, Diocese of Down.

Gordon, Rev. Charles Douglas, Curate of Christ Church, New Radford; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Nottingham.

Hacon, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Willoughton; Vicar of Searby-with-Owmby, Lincolnshire.

Houghton, Rev. E. J. W., M.A., Assistant-Master of Bromsgrove School; Head Master of the King Edward School at Stratford-on-Avon.

Kemble, Rev. H. H., M.A., Vicar of Low Wray, Ambleside; Secretary to the Oxford Mission to Calcutta for the Deanery of Ambleside.

Pearce, Rev. Ernest Harold, M.A., Metropolitan Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society; Vicar of Christ Church, Newgate-street.

Robins, Rev. G. A., M.A., Rector of Eccleston, Chester; Private Chaplain to the Duke of Westminster.

Sanday, Rev. William, M.A., D.D., Fellow of Exeter, Ireland Professor of Exegesis; Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

Spafford, Rev. Albert, M.A., Senior Curate of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead; Perpetual Curate of Helsby, near Frodsham.

Walker, Rev. John Mills, M.A., Retired Indian Chaplain (Madras); Vicar of Harrold, Bedford.

Williams, Rev. C. F. W. T., M.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Bedminster; Curate-in-Charge of the District Church of Mosborough, Eckington, near Rotherham.

Williams, Rev. David, Curate of Holy Trinity, Swansea; Vicar of St, John's, Clydach, Swansea.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bent, Rev. Robert Paul, M.A., J.P., Rector of Hampnett and Stowell, at 1, Clarence-villas, Windsor, on the 20th inst.

Day, Rev. Frederick, M.A., late of Heighington, and for many years Curate of Washingborough, at Bracondale, Norwich, on the 22nd inst., aged 68.

Delmar, Rev. William Baldock, for fifty-six years Rector of the Parish, at Elmstone Rectory, Wingham, Kent, on the 16th inst., aged 80.

Hewson, Rev. Frederick Some, M.A., Vicar of Combroke and Compton Verney, Warwick, at Parkstone, on the 22nd inst., aged 41.

Thompson, Rev. Henry T. A., Priest, B.A. Ch. Ch., Oxon, late Incumbent of Springvale, and for thirteen years Missionary in the Diocese of Maritzburg, at Enhlonhlweni, near Ladysmith, on the 18th ult., aged 36.

Vernon, Rev. Henry John, B.A., Magdalen Hall, Oxford, Assistant-Secretary S.P.G. 1846-66, Vicar of Eckington, Worcestershire, 1866-77, at Richmond House, Boughton, Chester, on the 10th inst., aged 79.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229125